DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 774 CE 006 301

AUTHOR Patterson, Patricia L.
TITLE A Description and Analysis of the Women Faculty in Pennsylvania's State-Owned Colleges and University.
REPORT NO VT-102-483
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 138p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; *Career Choice; Data Analysis; Doctoral Theses; Educational Background; Job Satisfaction; *Occupational Surveys; *Participant Characteristics; Personal Interests; Questionnaires; Sex Role; *State Colleges; State Universities; Tables (Data); Teacher Characteristics; Vocational Development; *Women Professors
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to describe the female faculty in the 14 State-owned colleges and University of Pennsylvania. Information was collected via questionnaire concerning personal backgrounds, academic status, preparation, work experience, attitudes and satisfactions concerning careers, and professional responsibilities and involvement. Questions were also asked about influences affecting choice of career and the effect of being female on their careers. Basic to the research was the assumption that knowledge of the background and characteristics of women faculty would contribute to the goal of greater utilization of women in higher education. It was also felt that information from the study would aid those persons involved in career counseling of women. Among the results obtained, it was found that women faculty: (1) occupied positions relatively lower than the men in their institutions, (2) had chosen careers in higher education based on the expected intellectual challenge and an interest in working with college students, and (3) nine out of ten were satisfied or very satisfied with their careers. A sample instrument selected typical responses, additional tabulated data, and a bibliography appear in the appendixes. (NJ)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED118774

FINAL REPORT

A DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE WOMEN FACULTY IN PENNSYLVANIA'S STATE-OWNED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITY

Project No. 19-3024

by

Patricia L. Patterson

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Indiana, Pennsylvania

August, 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT

copyright by

Patricia L. Patterson

1974

A DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE WOMEN FACULTY IN PENNSYLVANIA'S STATE-OWNED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITY

by

Patricia L. Patterson

B.S., Grove City College, 1950

M.Ed., The Pennsylvania State University, 1957

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty in the School of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted to

Patricia L. Patterson

to A/M/A.R.M, E.R.I.C, and organizations operating under agreements with the U.S. Office of Education and National Institute of Education. Further reproduction outside the A/M/A.R.M and E.R.I.C systems requires permission of the copyright owner.

University of Pittsburgh

1974

VT 103483

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		v
I.	BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM.	1
II.	THE PROBLEM.	5
	A. Statement of the Problem	5
	B. Justification of the Problem	5
	C. Delimitations of the Study	6
	D. Definition of Terms.	6
III.	PROCEDURES	8
	A. Data Required.	8
	B. Method of Obtaining Data	8
	C. Analysis of Data	11
IV.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	12
V.	THE FINDINGS	24
VI.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	83
	A. Summary and Conclusions.	83
	B. Recommendations.	90
APPENDICES		95
BIBLIOGRAPHY		127

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
1.	Fathers' Principal Occupations.	24
2.	Highest Level of Parents' Education	25
3.	Marital Status.	26
4.	Children of Respondents	26
5.	Husband's Occupation.	27
6.	Age of Respondents.	28
7.	Time at Which Higher Education was First Considered as a Career	29
8.	Highest Level of Respondents Formal Education . . .	29
9.	Location and Type of Institution at Which Respondents Earned Degrees.	30
10.	Year of Most Recent Graduate Work	31
11.	Reasons Given by Respondents When Questioned as to Why They Have Not or Will Not Obtain a Doctorate.	32
12.	Academic Rank of Respondents.	34
13.	Salaries of Respondents	35
14.	Educational Employment Experience Prior to Entering Higher Education.	36
15.	Number of Four-Year Institutions of Higher Education in Which Respondents Have Been Employed Full-Time	37
16.	Years Employed in Higher Education and at Current Institution	38
17.	Career Interruptions.	39
18.	Description of Work Performed by Respondents. . . .	40
19.	Titles of Women Engaged in Administrative Work. . .	41
20.	Respondents' Teaching Areas	43
21.	Research Done by Respondents.	44
22.	College-Wide Committee, Council or Cabinet Participation	46
23.	Influence of Certain Factors on the Choice of Higher Education as a Career.	49
24.	Factors Having the Greatest Influence on a Position at a State-Owned Institution Rather Than a Private One	50
25.	Feelings Concerning Present Position.	52
26.	Reasons Given for Finding Present Position Better Than Had Been Expected.	53
27.	Reasons Given for Finding Present Position Less Than Had Been Expected.	54
28.	Three Rewards of Greatest Value Received From Work.	56
29.	Respondents' Aspirations Concerning Other Positions in Higher Education	58
30.	Reasons for Respondents Not Wanting Another Position in Higher Education.	59

Page

31. Factors Causing Greatest Dissatisfaction with Career Choice 60
32. Equality of Male/Female Status on Campus. 63
33. Ranks for Which Promotion was Denied. 64
34. Would You Encourage Young Women to Choose Higher Education as a Vocation 66
35. Reasons for Negative or Uncertain Reaction to Encouraging Young Women to Choose Careers in Higher Education. 66
36. The Effect of Being a Woman in Higher Education . . 67
37. Why Respondents Found Being Female Advantageous to Them in Their Profession. 68
38. Over-all Satisfaction with Present Career in Higher Education. 73
39. Means by which Institutions can Best Meet the Needs of Their Female Faculty 74
40. Chi Square Values for Respondents Classified by Satisfaction with Career Choice and Certain Other Variables 77

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many individuals have contributed to the completion of this study and to all of them I am grateful.

Special appreciation is given to Dr. George W. Anderson for his guidance and encouragement and to Dr. Carol Wildemann for her assistance in computerizing the data.

Finally, to the women faculty in Pennsylvania's fourteen state colleges and university, I extend a special word of thanks. Without their interest and participation, this study would have been impossible.

I. BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Recognizing that there were "prejudices and outmoded customs" acting to bar the "full realization of women's basic rights," President Kennedy in 1961 established the Commission on the Status of Women. It was fitting that no less a personage than Eleanor Roosevelt chair this expansive undertaking to evaluate the positions and functions of American women in the home, the economy, and society.[1] Since the establishment of the Commission, the United States has found herself with a new "cause celebre"--women's rights.

We have seen in the last decade a proliferation of literature for and about women. Women's caucuses of professional groups have diligently gathered data showing attitudes and practices toward women. New organizations have emerged arousing women to claim status and rights which tradition and culture have denied them. At all levels of government, action has been initiated to eliminate practices directed toward women which violate this country's commitment to the value of the individual and deny it efficient and full utilization of its human resources.

Women today are seeking more than equal protection of

---

[1] American Women, ed. by Margaret Mead and Frances B. Kaplan (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 9.

the law in the areas of employment and education. Perhaps more important, they are requesting--in some cases, demanding--the opportunity to be viewed not as a class but as unique individuals--each one allowed to define herself and her particular goals. Women must be offered real choices ". . .each one underwritten by fair laws and fair practice and a social climate that ensures that each life pattern will be considered a feasible and dignified one."[1]

In July, 1971, the Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, John C. Pittenger, appointed a task force to study the problems of women in education and to recommend actions to eliminate sexism in this area. Representatives of the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Pennsylvanians for Women's Rights, and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Committee comprised this group. Their report entitled, Sexism in Education, reveals that women in Pennsylvania have not had real alternatives and have been discriminated against in employment both subtly and openly. Of the many recommendations made in this report, one is particularly relevant to this study; namely, that young women should be presented life-style models other than marriage and homemaking.

Due in large part to the recommendations of this report, Mr. Pittenger directed Pennsylvania's public school officials, administrators in higher education, and all others

---

[1] Ibid., p. 204.

involved with educational programs of the Department of Education to sensitize personnel to sexism, to eliminate sex-segregation and stereotyping, and to establish affirmative action programs to assure employment equity to women.

This study developed from an interest on the part of the writer in the recommendations of the Joint Task Force on Sexism in Education and the directives of the Secretary of Education concerning equal opportunity for women in higher education. Further encouragement for its development was found in an article by Ruth Eckert concerning academic women in Minnesota.

> If efforts are to be accelerated to seek out and use wisely this promising source [of talent] much more must be known about why women join college faculties, how they compare in their backgrounds and services with their male colleagues, and what their basic attitudes and satisfactions are with their career choice.[1]

Within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, there are 14 state-owned and operated institutions of higher learning. Some of these were founded as private academies; others were the result of the Normal School Act of 1857. This legislation, designed to prepare teachers for Pennsylvania's newly acquired public school system, gave to the 14 institutions a community of purpose and title. They became the Pennsylvania State Normal Schools.

By 1927 the Commonwealth had purchased all of the

---

[1]Ruth E. Eckert, "Academic Woman Revisited; Minnesota," Liberal Education, LVII (December, 1971), p. 479.

normal schools and then proceeded to convert them to degree-granting institutions with four-year curricula. All of the schools educated elementary and secondary teachers and certain ones offered curricula in special areas such as business, physical education, home economics, music, art, library science, industrial arts, and atypical education. With this change in structure, the institutions became known as State Teachers Colleges.

They continued to function as teacher training institutions until 1960. At that time the State Legislature, faced with the growing demand for a college education by the populace, amended the School Code to make the state teachers colleges multi-purpose institutions. Thus the 14 schools obtained their third designation--The Pennsylvania State Colleges.

Five years later Indiana, the largest of the group, was redesignated as Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

As a contribution to the fund of knowledge regarding women in higher education, this study was designed to ascertain specific facts regarding the female faculty in these colleges and university.

II. THE PROBLEM

A. Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to describe the female faculty in the 14 state-owned colleges and university of Pennsylvania.

A secondary problem was to show relationships among certain variables.

B. Justification of the Problem

Basic to this research were the following assumptions:

1. That greater utilization of women in higher education--a goal of affirmative action--should be aided by knowledge concerning the academic status and professional responsibilities and involvement of those women presently in the field as well as information about their personal backgrounds, their reasons for entering the profession, and their attitudes and satisfactions concerning this career choice.

2. That the information from this study will be of value to those persons engaged in the career counseling of women.

3. That the findings will present a life-style model which will encourage women to set career goals in higher education.

4. That no state-wide study of this nature has been done in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

C. Delimitations of the Study

The study was delimited in geographic scope to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. All of the institutions involved are coeducational and state owned.

The women included in the study were all of those listed as personnel with academic rank on the October 31, 1973, Complement Control Report in the Department of Public Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. The description of these women has been limited to those items included in the questionnaire.

D. Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study the following terms are so defined:

Academic Preparation and Work Experience includes the highest level of the respondent's formal education, the year in which she completed her most recent graduate credits, whether her degrees were received within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or outside, whether her degrees were received from a public or private institution, what her work experience has been since obtaining a baccalaureate degree, the nature of any career interruptions, the number of 4-year institutions of higher education at which she has been employed full time, the duration of her employment in higher education, the duration of her employment at her present institution.

Academic Status shall include rank, whether the employment is full-time or part-time, and salary.

Attitudes and Satisfactions Concerning Career Choice shall include those factors having influence on the respondent's choice of a career in higher education, her reasons for having chosen a public rather than a private institution in which to work, the most valued rewards from her work, an assessment of her present position in light of pre-conceived expectations of it, her aspirations of holding another position in higher education, the sources of greatest dissatisfaction to the respondent in her career choice, the respondent's opinions concerning the status of women on her

particular campus, the respondent's attitude toward encouraging young women to pursue a career in higher education, her perception of the effect that her sex has had on her career, and an evaluation of her over-all feelings toward her present career as well as her observation of a means by which the institution employing her can better meet the needs of its female faculty.

Female Faculty shall include all women holding academic rank at the institutions involved.

Fourteen State-Owned Colleges and University of Pennsylvania shall include Bloomsburg State College, California State College, Cheney State College, Clarion State College, East Stroudsburg State College, Edinboro State College, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Kutztown State College, Lock Haven State College, Mansfield State College, Millersville State College, Shippensburg State College, Slippery Rock State College, and West Chester State College.

Pennsylvania State College System (The) Those same institutions listed under the term, Fourteen State-Owned Colleges and University of Pennsylvania.

Personal Background shall include the age of the respondent, the state or country of her birth, her marital status, the number of children she has, her husband's occupation, her father's occupation, the highest level of both parents' education, and when the respondent first considered a career in higher education.

Professional Responsibilities and Involvement shall include a description of the work done by the respondent; if a teacher, the discipline in which she teaches; the number of times within the past five years that she has been engaged in consultative work, research and publication; the kinds of publications the respondent has authored, co-authored, or edited; and the college-wide committees which she has chaired and on which she has served.

III. PROCEDURES

A. Data Required

The women on the faculties of the 14 state-owned colleges and university of Pennsylvania provided answers to questions about their personal backgrounds, their academic status, preparation, and work experience, their attitudes and satisfactions concerning their careers, and their professional responsibilities and involvement.

B. Method of Obtaining Data

A list of those women classified as personnel with academic rank was compiled from the October 31, 1973, Complement Control Report in the Department of Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Permission to use this source was authorized by Deputy Commissioner of Education, Warren Ringler, via Ms. Caren Blazey, Coordinator of Affirmative Action in the Department of Education.

A questionnaire was designed to elicit the data required. In the preparation of this instrument, some material was adapted from those questionnaires prepared by

Eckert and Stecklein, Leonard, and Ginzberg.[1]

The original questionnaire was pre-tested by a five-woman jury of faculty members at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. From the suggestions of this panel, a revised instrument, shown in Appendix A, was constructed.

Specifically, women provided demographic information concerning certain factors of their personal backgrounds, their academic preparation, their previous work experience as well as career interruptions, their current academic responsibilities and status, and their involvement in selected professional activities.

In addition, they were asked to specify when they first considered higher education as a career, to weigh the influence of certain factors on their choice of a career, to rank the three rewards of greatest value received from their work, to indicate their aspirations for other positions in higher education, and to report the one factor causing them the greatest dissatisfaction in their careers.

Furthermore, they were asked to tender their perceptions of the effect that being female had made upon their careers, their opinions of the veracity of certain statements concerning the status of women on their respective campuses,

---

[1]Ruth E. Eckert and John E. Stecklein, Job Motivations and Satisfactions of College Teachers (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961); Yvonne Elaine Leonard, "An Analysis of the Status of Women as Full-Time Faculty Members in Co-educational Colleges and Universities of California" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1963); Eli Ginzberg, Life Styles of Educated Women (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966).

their reasons for having chosen a position in a state-owned institution rather than a private one, their opinion as to whether current positions had equalled their pre-conceived expectations of them, and the official reasons given for their having been denied a promotion for which they were qualified.

Finally, the respondents rated their over-all satisfaction with a career in higher education, indicated whether they would encourage young women to choose a similar career, and specified the one way in which they felt their institutions could better meet the needs of its female faculty.

The questionnaire accompanied by a cover letter, shown in Appendix B, and a stamped addressed envelope were sent in January, 1974, to 1,187 women in the fourteen state-owned colleges and University of Pennsylvania.

In February, a post-card reminder, shown in Appendix C, was sent to those from whom no response had been received.

Inasmuch as a new term had begun at each of the schools since the preparation of the source document for the mailing list, each of the schools was contacted by telephone to determine if any of the non-respondents had left its employ. As a result of these calls, 89 names were eliminated from the original list leaving a total of 1,098 possible respondents. Seven-hundred forty-two questionnaires were returned. Of this number, 739 (67.6 percent) could be used.

C. Analysis of Data

The data were analyzed on the computer at the University of Pittsburgh. Frequency distributions and percentages were calculated. Certain of the variables were cross-tabulated and a chi square test of independence was made on them. Tables were developed to illustrate the findings. A narrative, incorporating the tables and specific comments of the respondents, was prepared to describe the findings of the study.

IV. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Although more women are taking positions in the labor market each year, occupationally they are more disadvantaged than they were thirty years ago.[1] There is additional evidence that the abilities and education of those women who become employed are not being fully utilized.

Although from 1940 to 1969 the proportion of women workers among all workers increased from 25 percent to 37 percent, the proportion of women holding professional and technical positions decreased from 45 percent to 37 percent.[2] The Women's Bureau reports that in 1969 ". . . 7 percent of employed women who had completed five or more years of college were working as service workers (including private household), operatives, sales workers, or clerical workers." These same occupations claimed 19 percent of employed women with four years of college.[3]

Teaching has long been recognized as one of the traditional "female" professions. However, it appears that in the United States teaching in higher education is

---

[1] U.S., Department of Labor, Underutilization of Women Workers, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971), p. iv.

[2] Ibid., p. 9.

[3] Ibid., p. 17.

increasingly defined as a male role.[1] Not since 1910 has there been a smaller proportion of women in the academe. The most recent figures available indicate that approximately one in five of the faculty and other professional staff in institutions of higher education are women.[2] This distribution is skewed toward the two-year colleges where a great proportion of academic women find employment.[3] Even in women's colleges the trend in employment has not favored the woman faculty member.[4]

Questions arise concerning those women who do obtain professional positions in institutions of higher learning. Are there similarities in their personal background; their professional experience and preparation? Is their academic status consistent with male colleagues having similar experience and preparation? Are they satisfied with their career choice?

In her study of full-time faculty in Minnesota schools offering at least a baccalaureate degree, Eckert found that 40 percent of the women were natives of the state of Minnesota. Most had grown up in middle-class homes where

---

[1]Cynthia F. Epstein, Woman's Place (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), p. 155.

[2]U.S., op. cit., p. 11.

[3]Helen S. Astin and Alan E. Bayer, "Sex Discrimination in Academe," Educational Record, LIII (Spring, 1972), p. 103.

[4]Jessie Bernard, "Demand: The Theory and Practice of Discrimination," Academic Women (University Park: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1964), p. 43.

their fathers had been tradesmen, farmers, skilled workers, or managers of their own businesses. Although both parents were usually high school graduates, one-third of the respondents reported parents with some college education. Approximately 22 percent reported that their mothers had been elementary or secondary school teachers. The typical female college professor was forty-six years of age; six years older than the average age of her male colleagues. Slightly less than half (45 percent) of these women were married and 29 percent reported having children.

The decision to become an academician appears to be one more of chance than planning. Only one in six of the women reported having made college teaching even a tentative career choice upon college graduation. Slightly better than half (53 percent) reported that their decision was the result of having been offered an unsought college teaching position.[1]

The doctorate has long been associated with entrance, status, tenure, and promotion in college and university employment. Certainly one factor relevant to the downward trend in employment of women in higher education is the decrease in the number of females pursuing a terminal degree. Whereas women earned approximately 15 percent of all doctorates in 1920, the proportion dropped to 10 percent in 1950

---

[1]Ruth E. Eckert, "Academic Woman Revisited; Minnesota," Liberal Education, LVII (December, 1971), pp. 479-487.

and has not since reached the 1920 level.[1]

Eckert corroborates this trend in reporting that whereas similar research in 1956 revealed 26 percent of the women having earned a doctorate, her more recent study showed a decrease of 6 percent in this area.[2]

Among the ranks in higher education, women are more apt to be found on the lower rungs of the ladder. Pollard found in the sampled institutions from the Southern, Middle Atlantic, and New England Regional Accrediting Associations that although women constituted almost 20 percent of the total faculties, they held 2.57 percent and 3.6 percent respectively of the full and associate professorships.[3]

Karch, too, reported in her study that women who taught professional education courses in institutions of higher learning were frequently assistant professors.[4]

Among the full-time faculty members in co-educational colleges and universities of California, Leonard found the largest single percent of women were assistant professors.

---

[1]U.S., Department of Labor, Trends in Educational Attainment of Women, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 10.

[2]Eckert, loc. cit.

[3]Lucille Addison Pollard, "Women on College and University Faculties: A Historical Survey and a Study of Their Present Academic Status" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1965).

[4]Jacqueline Quigley Karch, "Characteristics of Women Teachers of Education in Institutions of Higher Learning in the United States of America," (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1956).

The researcher was led to conclude that opportunities for women to advance beyond the assistant professorship were limited in the schools studied.[1]

The female faculty member is usually found in a department of the humanities or professional education. She is a teacher rather than a researcher or administrator. Unfortunately this contributes negatively to her academic status since the reward system in higher education appears to favor administration, research, and publication.[2] Not quite half of the respondents (49 percent) in the Minnesota study came from teaching positions in elementary or secondary schools and the average female had held her current position for nine years. Most of them indicated a financial independence in paying for education beyond the undergraduate level. Only about one in five reported having had an assistantship to aid them in their graduate work.[3] Similar findings were made by Astin and Bayer regarding graduate assistantships held by women.[4]

Few administrative posts are held by women. In January, 1970, the American Association of University Women conducted research, part of which was to evaluate the

---

[1]Yvonne Elaine Leonard, "An Analysis of the Status of Women as Full-Time Faculty Members in Co-educational Colleges and Universities of California," (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1963).

[2]Astin and Bayer, op. cit., 101.

[3]Eckert, loc, cit.

[4]Astin and Bayer, op. cit., 110.

participation of faculty women in the administrative levels of higher education. They found that women who held jobs termed as "administrative" did not, in fact, have positions of influence nor were these women truly engaged in policy-making. In answer to an open-end question requesting information of all positions in the administrative staff for which qualified women were generally sought, an average of less than one position per school was reported. The data further showed that department chairmanships were infrequently held by women although 90 percent of the schools surveyed indicated that promotional policies were the same for men and women. Of the total schools reporting (454) the average number of women in such positions was 2.6 per school. Thirty-four of the schools reported no women as heads of academic departments.[1]

Certainly one of the more discouraging aspects of employment in higher education for today's woman is that she frequently finds her academic status to be inconsistent with that of her male colleagues having comparable experience and preparation. LaSorte found that female professors' salaries were not equal to those of their male counterparts at any level of rank. Nor did promotion for women produce "salary

---

[1]Ruth M. Oltman, "Campus 1970 Where Do Women Stand?", Research Report of a Survey on Women in Academe (Washington: American Association of University Women, December, 1970).

levels commensurate with men."[1]

More often than not these inconsistencies are attributed to lack of productivity on the part of the female. However, there is evidence to indicate that the sex of the academician more than factors of productivity weighs heavily in the prediction of salary and rank.

After conducting research which controlled a large number of the significant and relevant variables accounting for differences in rank among academic personnel, Astin and Bayer concluded that ". . . sex is a better independent predictor of rank than such other factors as the number of years since completion of education, the number of years employed at the present institution, or the number of books published."[2] They further concluded that, in general, graduation from a prestigious institution would result in an individual's attaining a high rank sooner than graduation from a less prestigious school. However, a female faculty member having obtained her degree from a prestigious institution cannot expect to be promoted to a high rank as quickly as her male colleague, even when she demonstrates scholarly productivity.[3]

In the area of salaries, the researchers found that

---

[1]Michael A. LaSorte, "Academic Women's Salaries: Equal Pay for Equal Work?", Journal of Higher Education, XLII (April, 1971), p. 275.

[2]Astin and Bayer, op. cit., 105.

[3]Ibid., 107.

". . . sex is a better independent predictor of salary than such other factors as number of years of professional employment or whether one holds a doctorate."[1]

Academic women are further disadvantaged professionally because salary size is positively related to the recipient's marital status and size of family. Inasmuch as fewer professional women are married, and if married do not have large families, conclusions concerning their salary seem obvious. The researchers found, however, that even those women who were married and who had large families received lower salaries than men of similar marital and family status.[2]

The reward system of higher education has come under the attack of many writers as being biased toward the behaviors and activities of men. Kreps charges that women are expected to be teachers; yet, higher pay at the university goes toward research.

> What appears to have happened in the past is perhaps the worst set of circumstances: women have chosen their disciplines and their functions within the perceived role expectations, going into teaching (most often in colleges) in those areas in which they faced the least competition from men. Having made this commitment, women have then spent their

---

[1] Ibid., 108.

[2] Ibid., 109.

> time teaching and counselling, and as a result have failed to advance in rank and salary because they were "unproductive."[1]

Astin and Bayer question the assumption that productivity is an important and desirable characteristic of the academic world.

> Few have examined how such a characteristic affects students or whether the quality of education that students receive is really better at an institution where faculty publish a great deal and are highly visible to their professional colleagues.[2]

They call ". . . for an honest re-examination of a reward system that encourages faculty members to engage in activities that cause a triangular conflict among teachers, students, and administrators. . ."[3]

Citing the Matched Scientists study supported by the National Institute of Mental Health, Dinerman attributes the cause of low productivity among women to the fact that they are excluded from higher education's predominately male communications and information system.

> A disadvantaged position in the communications system of one's discipline will lead to low productivity when such variables as subject matter, length of past doctoral career training, and academic position are controlled.[4]

---

[1] Juanita M. Kreps, "The Woman Professional in Higher Education," in Women in Higher Education, eds. W. Todd Furniss and Patricia A. Graham (Washington: American Council on Education, 1974), p. 75.

[2] Astin and Bayer, op. cit., 117.

[3] Ibid., p. 118.

[4] Beatrice Dinerman, "Sex Discrimination in Academia," Journal of Higher Education, XLII (April, 1971), p. 258.

She further elaborates that because of this exclusion, women miss opportunities for informal communication which often lead to research work and subsequent publication.

Chalmer queries whether the ". . . criteria employed for decisions about salary, promotions, and tenure are the optimum criteria for our society, or are they optimum for maintaining a predominance of men in higher education?"[1]

Epstein reminds us that "Whether or not there are real differences in productivity, it is certainly believed by both women and men alike that women do not produce equally. That belief has considerable power in excluding women from positions where productivity is important."[2]

Concerning the basic attitudes and satisfactions of women currently holding faculty positions in higher education there seems to be a paucity of information. In the Minnesota schools Eckert reports that almost half of the respondents were "very satisfied" with their current careers and most of the rest reported "moderate satisfaction."

Leonard's study revealed that 87.5 percent of the women showed a desire to remain in their present positions. When asked whether they felt their sex had been advantageous to them professionally, 15.5 percent thought it had been an advantage; 19.3 percent, a disadvantage; 36.6 percent, both

---

[1]E.L. Chalmers, Jr., "Achieving Equity for Women in Higher Education Graduate Enrollment and Faculty Status," The Journal of Higher Education, XLIII (October, 1972), p. 524.

[2]Epstein, op. cit., p. 73.

an advantage and a disadvantage. Twelve failed to respond to this question and 16.6 percent thought sex was irrelevant in this context.

Most of the respondents indicated that they thought women in areas of drama, English, mathematics and science were at the greatest disadvantage professionally. Only in one area--home economics--was it considered an advantage to be a woman.[1]

Summary

Approximately 20 percent of the professional staff in institutions of higher education are women. These women usually teach in the areas of the humanities or professional education. They are more frequently found in the ranks of instructor or assistant professor than in those of associate or full professor. Few are administrators and there is evidence that among those so classified are many who do not hold influential or policy-making positions.

In any given professional rank, the salary of the female faculty member will not equal that of her male counter part. Nor can she expect from promotions salary increments equal to her male colleagues. Strong evidence indicates that these inequities are due to her sex rather than her productivity, professional experience, or academic

---

[1]Yvonne Elaine Leonard, loc. cit.

preparation.

In spite of what seems to be a decidedly disadvantaged professional position, many women indicate satisfaction with their careers in higher education.

V. THE FINDINGS

The respondents to this study reported birthplaces in forty-two states, the District of Columbia, and nineteen foreign countries. Almost half of the women were native Pennsylvanians. Approximately two-fifths (39.2 percent) of the remaining number came from the neighboring states of New York, Ohio, New Jersey, West Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware. (Appendix D)

TABLE 1

FATHERS' PRINCIPAL OCCUPATIONS

Classification	Frequency	Percent
Skilled/semi-skilled	204	28.3
Professional/technical	201	27.8
Managerial	179	24.8
Clerical and sales	67	9.3
Farming	62	8.6
Other	9	1.2
Total	722*	100.0

*The total frequencies in this and subsequent tables varies because respondents did not answer all questions.

More than 50 percent of the fathers of these women had been or were currently engaged in skilled/semi-skilled labor or professional/technical occupations. The division between the two groups was about equal. Nearly one-fourth

(24.8 percent) were reported in managerial positions. The latter included officials of government, private entrepreneurs, and those in corporate upper and middle management.

TABLE 2

HIGHEST LEVEL OF PARENTS' EDUCATION

Level	Father		Mother	
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent
Less than 6 yrs.	41	5.6	20	2.7
6-9 years	164	22.4	135	18.4
10-12 years	208	28.5	286	39.0
College (no bacc.)	115	15.7	159	21.7
College (bacc.)	79	10.8	83	11.3
Post-baccalaureate	124	17.0	51	6.9
Total	731	100.0	734	100.0

Seventy-two percent of the fathers of these women and 78 percent of the mothers had at least ten to twelve years of education; almost 42 percent (41.7 percent) of both parents had gone beyond that level. At both the secondary and collegiate levels of education, parents of these women had considerably more education than is true of men and women in the general population.[1]

[1]U.S., Department of Labor, Background Facts on Women Workers in the United States, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 11.

TABLE 3

MARITAL STATUS

Classification	Frequency	Percent
Married	333	45.1
Single	305	41.4
Divorced	58	7.9
Widowed	31	4.2
Separated	10	1.4
Total	737	100.0

As Table 3 reveals, the number of unmarried women in this study (41.4 percent) is almost equal to those who are married (45.1 percent). Individuals who are divorced, separated or widowed compose 13.5 percent of the group.

TABLE 4

CHILDREN OF RESPONDENTS

Number of Children	Frequency	Percent	Children in Elem. or Sec. Schools	Percent
1	87	30.0	76	54.7
2	108	37.2	40	28.8
3	62	21.4	17	12.2
4	26	9.0	6	4.3
5	4	1.4	0	
6	3	1.0	0	
Total	290	100.0	139	100.0

Table 4 shows the total number of children reported by the respondents as well as those in elementary or

secondary school. Two hundred ninety women (39.2 percent) reported having families. The average number of children per family was two. One hundred thirty-nine of the respondents have children in elementary or secondary school. Inasmuch as the number of pre-school children was not requested, it is possible only to generalize that at least 18.8 percent of the women in this study are the mothers of minors.

TABLE 5

HUSBANDS' OCCUPATION

Classification	Frequency	Percent
Professional/technical	232	70.5
Managerial	39	11.9
Skilled/semi-skilled	19	5.8
Clerical and sales	8	2.4
Farming	3	.9
Other	28	8.5
Total	329	100.0

Seventy percent of the husbands were reported to be in professional/technical occupations; eleven percent in managerial employment. More than half of the men in the "Other" grouping were retired; five were graduate students.

TABLE 6

AGE OF RESPONDENTS

Years	Frequency	Percent
0 - 20	0	0.0
21 - 25	30	4.1
26 - 30	112	15.3
31 - 35	105	14.4
36 - 40	82	11.2
41 - 45	104	14.3
46 - 50	98	13.4
51 - 55	73	10.0
56 - 60	80	11.0
61 - 65	40	5.5
66 - 70	5	.7
71 - 75	1	.1
Total	730	100.0

The women in this study ranged from 21 to 72 years of age with a rounded median of 43 years. Almost ninety percent of the women were between 26 and 60 years of age. As Table 6 illustrates, within this range, the ages are rather evenly distributed in each five-year interval. No greater than a 5 percent variation occurs.

TABLE 7

TIME AT WHICH HIGHER EDUCATION WAS FIRST CONSIDERED AS A CAREER

Classification	Frequency	Percent
Before baccalaureate degree	246	33.6
After bacc. - before master's	255	34.9
After master's	230	31.5
Total	731	100.0

When asked at what point in their schooling they first considered higher education as a possible career, the women were almost evenly divided in their answers. Approximately one-third had given consideration at each of the choices indicated to them: before receiving a baccalaureate degree, after receiving the baccalaureate but before receiving a master's degree, after receiving a master's degree.

TABLE 8

HIGHEST LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS FORMAL EDUCATION

Level	Frequency	Percent
Baccalaureate	37	5.0
Master's	83	11.2
Work beyond master's - no doctorate	442	59.8
Doctorate	146	19.8
Post-doctoral work	31	4.2
Total	739	100.0

Four of every five respondents (83.8 percent) had

completed some graduate work beyond the master's level. Numerous of these individuals specified that they had completed "all but the [doctoral] dissertation" or were currently working on it. Twenty-two of the women reported they had earned two master's degrees, three reported they had obtained three master's. Earned doctorates were held by 24 percent of those responding. Post doctoral work had been undertaken by 17 percent of those holding doctorates. Two Fulbright scholars were among the group as was the recipient of an administrative internship of the American Council on Education. Women also indicated that they held professional artist's diplomas, specialist's certificates, and a director's degree. Several volunteered that they had taken academic work in Great Britain, Germany, and France.

TABLE 9

LOCATION AND TYPE OF INSTITUTION AT WHICH RESPONDENTS EARNED DEGREES

	Location				Type			
	In Pa.		Outside Pa.		Public		Private	
Degree	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Bacc.	381	52.7	342	47.3	409	61.8	253	38.2
Master's	338	49.8	341	50.2	355	57.2	266	42.8
Doct.	63	35.6	114	64.4	92	52.9	82	47.1

The participants earned slightly more than half (52.7 percent) of their baccalaureate degrees in Pennsylvania. The percentage of master's degrees conferred within the Commonwealth (49.8 percent) was almost equal to those given

outside (50.2 percent). However, the number of doctorates obtained outside Pennsylvania exceeded those that came from within by a 1.8:1 ratio. Public institutions were more frequently the donors of all degrees than were private schools; the margin being widest at the baccalaureate level.

TABLE 10

YEAR OF MOST RECENT GRADUATE WORK

Year	Frequency	Percent
1974 - 1970	458	63.4
1969 - 1965	143	19.8
1964 - 1960	53	7.3
1959 - 1955	32	4.4
1954 - 1950	23	3.2
1949 - 1945	9	1.2
1944 - 1940	2	.3
1939 - 1935	2	.3
1934 - 1930	1	.1
Total	723	100.0

Sixty-three percent of those responding had taken graduate work within the past five years. Approximately 5 percent (5.1 percent) reported their most recent work was taken prior to 1955.

TABLE 11

REASONS GIVEN BY RESPONDENTS WHEN QUESTIONED AS TO WHY THEY HAVE NOT OR WILL NOT OBTAIN A DOCTORATE

Reason	Frequency	Percent
Age	65	19.6
Not worth the effort	43	13.1
Family concerns come first	41	12.5
Not necessary for present career expectations	37	11.3
Would rather take advanced work in special interest area instead of degree program	30	9.2
Not interested	27	8.2
Have second (or third) masters which is considered a terminal degree in field	17	5.2
Lack of finances	14	4.3
Job too demanding in terms of health and time	12	3.7
Inaccessibility of proper institution	11	3.4
Misc. reasons	31	9.5
Total	328	100.0

Age was cited as the main reason for an individual's not having obtained a doctorate. Most of the women who gave this reason were in their late 50's and early 60's; however, a few were in their early 40's and one was 38 years of age.

Next in order of frequency were those comments which indicated that the participants did not feel they would benefit from a doctorate or that the benefits derived would not be commensurate with the work involved. Forty-three women (13.1 percent) were in this group. Typical comments were:

"A waste of time by my standards. I have 66 graduate credits in my field . . . expect to continue this way."

"Reached highest rank without it."

"A doctorate would not be of value in enabling me to perform my duties more effectively."

"If I felt a doctorate would make me a better teacher I would have considered it."

"Do not like the pressures involved in getting a degree; but do enjoy taking courses."

"The conviction that the degree would not really contribute to the quality of work I perform."

Academic work in special interest areas rather than a degree program was preferred by some of the respondents; others considered conferences and clinics to be of more immediate value than university course work. Approximately nine percent (9.2 percent) of the participants indicated an option for these avenues of professional improvement.

Married women placed family concerns (e.g., the rearing of children, the advancement of husbands' professional goals) before their own plans.

Thirty-seven (11.3 percent) indicated that a doctorate was not necessary for their career expectations and 27 (8.2 percent), without elaboration, simply stated that they were "not interested" in this degree.

Other explanations given by three to five percent of the women were: the inaccessibility of a proper institution for completing graduate work, a lack of finances, a current job which was too demanding in terms of health and time, and

the possession of a second (or third) master's degree which is considered terminal in certain fields.

The "miscellaneous" category includes those responses which were cited by less than ten women. Included in these widely disparate responses were the following reasons: diminishing job opportunities in higher education; experiences of discrimination in graduate programs; personal needs in terms of a marriage and family; involvement in community affairs; lack of interest in the responsibilities that usually accompany the degree (e.g., graduate teaching, administration); the expectation of leaving college teaching; the rigidity of degree programs; and a preference to spend time traveling.

TABLE 12

ACADEMIC RANK OF RESPONDENTS

Rank	Frequency	Percent
Professor	105	14.3
Associate Professor	209	28.4
Assistant Professor	279	38.0
Instructor	142	19.3
Total	735	100.0

Table 12 indicates that more women held assistant professorships than any other rank (38.0 percent). When the percentages in the two lower ranks are compared with those in the upper ranks there is a 14 percent margin in favor of the lower ranks.

TABLE 13

SALARIES OF RESPONDENTS

Variable	Nine- Ten-Month Contract Freq.	Percent	Eleven- Twelve-Month Contract Freq.	Percent
Less than $ 8,000	24	3.5	2	4.4
$ 8,000 - $10,999	72	10.5	1	2.2
$11,000 - $13,999	185	27.1	16	34.7
$14,000 - $16,999	211	30.9	5	10.9
$17,000 - $19,999	127	18.6	8	17.4
$20,000 - $22,999	57	8.4	8	17.4
$23,000 - $25,999	7	1.0	3	6.5
$26,000 and above	0	0.0	3	6.5
Total	683	100.0	46	100.0

Ninety-four percent of the women reported that they were full-time employees and 93 percent indicated they worked under a nine- or ten-month contract. The median salary for the latter group was in the $14,000 to $16,999 interval. Interestingly, the median salary of those holding eleven- or twelve-month contracts was within the same interval. This is due primarily to the small size of this group and to the fact that among those holding eleven- or twelve-month contracts there are proportionately more women with only a baccalaureate or only a master's degree. The compensation scale for the 14 institutions is based upon academic rank. Rank, to some degree, is a matter of educational requirements. For example, in order to be eligible for the rank of assistant professor, an academician should have <u>at least</u> 10 credits beyond a master's degree. Appendix E shows the highest level of edu-

cation indicated by those under each of the contracts.

TABLE 14

EDUCATIONAL EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE PRIOR TO ENTERING HIGHER EDUCATION

Variable	Frequency	Percent
None	220	29.9
Elementary or secondary	465	63.0
Two-year institutions	19	2.6
Elementary, secondary and two-year institutions	33	4.5
Total	737	100.0

Seven of every ten of the participants in this study have had previous educational employment on other than the four-year college or university level. Four hundred ninety-eight women--96.3 percent of those having had previous educational employment--had worked in either or both elementary or secondary levels.

TABLE 15

NUMBER OF FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN WHICH RESPONDENTS HAVE BEEN EMPLOYED FULL-TIME

Institutions	Frequency	Percent
1	430	61.9
2	164	23.6
3	53	7.6
4	22	3.2
5	14	2.0
6	7	1.0
7	1	.1
8	2	.3
9	2	.3
Total	695	100.0

Table 15 shows the number of four-year institutions of higher education in which the respondents have been employed on a full-time basis. Although a few people had been employed in more than 6 four-year institutions, low mobility was characteristic of the group. More than three in five (61.9 percent) replied that they had taught at only one such institution and four in five had not had experience in more than two.

TABLE 16

YEARS EMPLOYED IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND AT CURRENT INSTITUTION

Years	In Higher Education Freq.	Percent	At Current Institution Freq.	Percent
0 - 4*	197	26.8	303	41.2
5 - 9	253	34.4	273	37.1
10 - 14	131	17.8	86	11.7
15 - 19	72	9.8	43	5.9
20 - 24	43	5.8	19	2.6
25 - 29	22	3.0	7	1.0
30 - 34	14	1.9	1	.1
35 - 39	4	.5	3	.4
Total	736	100.0	735	100.0

*Zero represents less than 1 year of employment.

Years of service in higher education and at the present institution ranged from less than one year to thirty-seven years. The median in higher education was eight; in the current institution, five.

A request to list those major positions outside the field of education that had been held for one year or more brought responses from slightly more than 32 percent of the women. As might be expected various kinds of office work were mentioned frequently; as were positions as nurse, librarian, case worker, and counselor. Among the other job titles given were: professional musician, dietition, laboratory technician, research analyst, translator, magazine and newspaper editor and writer, utility home service advisor, sales representative, legislative assistant, recreation director and various positions within the armed forces.

TABLE 17

CAREER INTERRUPTIONS

Reason	Frequency	Percent
Graduate study	127	48.5*
Birth and care of children	126	48.1
Relocation of family due to husband's employment	36	13.7
Inability to obtain suitable professional employment	28	10.7
Personal illness	20	7.6
Caring for aged parents	10	3.8
Illness of others	9	3.4
Volunteer work	5	1.9
Other	20	7.6

*Based on 262 women who reported career interruptions.

Career interruptions were cited by 262 (35.0 percent) of the respondents. Graduate study and birth and care of children were the reasons given most frequently for temporary career cessation. In each case 48 percent of those indicating interruptions reported one or both of these reasons. Twenty-four percent of the respondents indicated that they had experienced career interruptions due to their husbands having been relocated or an inability to obtain suitable professional employment. In the final category, seven women reported that they had left higher education temporarily to try careers outside academia, five had traveled, and the remaining number had left for a variety of personal reasons.

TABLE 18

DESCRIPTION OF WORK PERFORMED BY RESPONDENTS

Description	Frequency	Percent
Teaching only	451	61.0
Teaching and administration	168	22.7
Administration only	54	7.3
Librarianship	53	7.2
Counseling	6	.8
Other	7	1.0
Total	739	100.0

More than 80 percent of the women in this study (83.7 percent) did some teaching at their institutions. Sixty-one percent described their work solely as "teaching." More than twenty-two percent (22.7 percent) combined instruction with administration, supervision, counseling, coaching, and a variety of other major responsibilities. Approximately seven percent of the group (7.3 percent) engaged exclusively in administrative work. An almost equal number (7.2 percent) in librarianship.

TABLE 19

TITLES OF WOMEN ENGAGED IN ADMINISTRATIVE WORK

Title	Frequency	Percent
Assistant or associate	46	31.5
Chairperson	24	16.4
Coordinator	22	15.1
Director	20	13.7
Dean	10	6.9
Other	24	16.4
Total	146	100.0

Table 19 illustrates the titles held by those respondents in administrative roles (with or without teaching responsibilities). It is evident that most of the women have titles indicating their positions are in less than the top echelons of institutional management. There were no presidents or vice presidents among the group. One individual volunteered that she would be assuming a position as assistant vice president in the next college term.

The title of Dean was held by only ten respondents (6.9 percent). Five of these were in the area of student affairs, three being Deans of Women. Two Deans of Academic Administration were among the group as was one each in home economics, library science, and a division of humanities and fine arts.

Directorships were held by 13.7 percent of the respondents. Two served in the area of general administra-

tion, four in student affairs, the remainder in academic administration. Examples of institutional areas in which these women worked are: college-wide program development, a division of humanities, cultural affairs, a planetarium and weather station, a pre-school program for migrant workers, a world cultures center, financial aid, counseling and career services, as well as programs of nursing, library science, women's athletics, and early childhood education.

Approximately 15 percent of the women were responsible for the coordination of various institutional programs. A few examples are: student teaching, women's athletics, reading, international education, clinical services, student equal opportunity programs, and resident living.

Women serving as chairpersons of their departments comprised 16.4 percent of the group. Six of these were in health and physical education departments and four in nursing. Other areas represented were: consumer services, sociology/anthropology, history, biology, foreign languages, speech and theatre, English, music, library science, elementary education and special education.

Of the forty-six women holding positions of "assistant" or "associate," three held the latter title. About 2 in 3 (65.2 percent) of the remainder were assistant deans or directors in the area of student affairs.

Included in the category of "other" titles is one head college librarian, eight women who are heads of departments within their libraries, seven who are supervisors of

student teachers, two women who are heads of curriculum libraries, two Head Start training officers, a counselor, an academic advisor of an equal opportunity program, a fellow of the American Council on Education, and an affirmative action officer.

TABLE 20

RESPONDENTS' TEACHING AREAS

Area	Frequency	Percent
Humanities	116	19.1
Nursing, Health, Physical Education	114	18.7
Elementary and early childhood education	92	15.2
Social sciences	85	14.1
Fine arts	56	9.3
Home economics	33	5.5
Science and mathematics	30	5.0
Library science	29	4.8
Other	50	8.3
Total	605	100.0

As Table 20 indicates, the teaching areas reported by the respondents were divided into nine categories. The largest areas of concentration were the humanities (19.1 percent), nursing and physical education (18.7 percent), elementary and early childhood education (15.2 percent), and the social sciences (14.1 percent).

Within the humanities, English and foreign language teachers predominated. However, philosophy, theatre, journalism, and speech were also represented.

Psychology, history and business teachers comprised the largest number of women in the social sciences. Lesser numbers taught in departments of geography, political science, sociology and anthropology, social welfare, and economics.

Within the science and mathematics area, mathematics and biology teachers were dominant. Physics, chemistry, astrology and meterology, botany, and earth and space science were also represented.

Reading and special education teachers composed 80 percent of those who indicated other instructional areas.

TABLE 21

RESEARCH DONE BY RESPONDENTS

Classification	Frequency	Percent
Research without degree; without publication	202	47.9
Research with degree; without publication	104	24.6
Research without degree; with publication	60	14.2
Research with degree; with publication	56	13.3
Total	422	100.0

When asked if they had done any research in the past five years, 57.3 percent of the women replied that they had. More than one-third of that group (37.9 percent) had used their research to obtain a degree and 27.5 percent had published their work.

One hundred seventy women (23.0 percent) reported that they had had articles published within the past five years. No less than 156 different periodicals have carried by-lines by Pennsylvania women faculty. Appendix F, while not complete, shows the variety of such publications.

A very small number of women (8.8 percent) had authored, co-authored, or edited books within the specified time period. Seventy-five percent of the publications were described as textbooks or professional material.

Less than half of the women (42.4 percent) had been engaged in some consultative work within the past five years. Forty-six percent of these indicated they had participated to the extent of one or two times; 19 percent had been involved ten or more times. Many of the latter indicated that they were consulted by clients "regularly" or on a "continual basis."

TABLE 22

COLLEGE-WIDE COMMITTEE, COUNCIL OR CABINET PARTICIPATION

Area of Assignment	Frequency	Percent
Curricula	276	65.3*
Faculty affairs	223	52.7
Academic procedures	133	31.4
College or university senates	130	30.7
Equal opportunity	63	14.9
Student affairs and athletics	60	14.2
Selection of administrative personnel	43	10.2
Institutional development, finance, long-range planning	40	9.5
Other areas	84	19.9

*Based on 423 women who indicated committee participation.

Fifteen committee titles were listed on the questionnaire to facilitate the respondents' replies concerning those college-wide committees, councils, or cabinets on which they had served within the past five years. Approximately sixty additional committees were named by the participants. The seventy-five titles were grouped and the data appear in Table 22. It is evident that women's participation has been most prominent in the areas of curriculum and faculty affairs. More than three in five (65.3 percent) who had been involved in any college-wide committee reported having worked in the area of curriculum; slightly more than half (52.7 percent), in faculty affairs. The latter category, included committees concerning themselves with sabbaticals, promotion, tenure, grievance, faculty welfare, and faculty evaluation. Approxi-

mately one-third of the group (31.4 percent) reported having participated on committees concerned with academic procedures (e.g., admissions, commencement, scholarships and loans, honors, accreditation). An almost equal number (30.7 percent) had been in the Senates of their schools.

In contrast, proportionately few women had been involved with institutional development (9.5 percent), the selection of administrative personnel (10.2 percent), student affairs and athletics (14.2 percent) or equal opportunity (14.9 percent).

Most of the committees included in the grouping entitled "Other areas" were not reported by more than four women. There are, however, several exceptions: participation in an administrative council was indicated by twenty-nine women, in councils of deans by thirteen, in research committees by seven, and in library committees by twelve.

As is indicated in the footnote to Table 22, 423 women (57.2 percent) reported some involvement in college-wide committees. Of the 316 who gave no indication of such participation, almost two-thirds (65.8 percent) had been at their present institutions for three years or more.

Chairmanship of at least one committee was reported by only 11.6 percent of the women involved in committee work. More than one-third (36.9 percent) of these chairmanships were on curriculum and faculty affairs committees.

It should perhaps be noted here that, in a few cases, respondents took the researcher to task for requesting

information concerning only publication, research, consultation, and college-wide committee participation. The following comment illustrates their viewpoint:

> "Your section of Professional Responsibilities and Involvement is inadequate. One of our women faculty members is chairman of a national committee of N.E.A. and all other members are men. In my own case I am vice chairman of a region of a state association and will be chairman next year. Also I am president of a new national professional group.... There are other desirable professional activities besides being published. However, I suppose you had to delimit the survey."

Individuals in the performing and graphic art areas indicated, quite justifiably, that in their respective fields performance and exhibitions are as important an indicator of productivity as publication may be in other areas. Women reported that they "had exhibited 15-20 times a year," "had exhibited work in regional and national shows," "exhibited each year in a juried show," "gave several performances each year."

Inasmuch as this survey requested information about only certain kinds of professional involvement, the data does not reflect, nor was it intended to reflect, the total professional productivity of the population of the study.

TABLE 23

INFLUENCE OF CERTAIN FACTORS ON THE CHOICE OF HIGHER EDUCATION AS A CAREER

Factor	Highly Important	%	Important	%	Of No Importance	%
Interest in working with students of college age	449	66.1	182	26.8	48	7.1
The expected intellectual challenge	430	63.4	189	27.8	60	8.8
Good working conditions and/or good pay	207	31.4	311	47.1	142	21.5
The value of the career to society	197	30.4	286	44.2	164	25.4
The influence of a teacher, parent, etc.	180	27.8	225	34.8	242	37.4
Chance	143	24.6	132	22.7	306	52.7
The opportunity to do research and/or publish	54	8.6	144	23.0	428	68.4
The opportunity to advance to administration	27	4.4	63	10.2	530	85.4

It would appear that there are two factors which had strong influence upon the respondents' career choice: their interest in working with students of college age and the expected intellectual challenge of the work. The former was ranked as highly important or important by 92.9 percent of those responding; the latter was similarly marked by 91.2 percent. The data also reveal that many of the participants (78.5 percent) view higher education as a career offering good working conditions and/or good pay. Almost an equal

number (74.6 percent) perceived the value of the career to society as a highly important or important factor in their decision. Less than one-third of the respondents entered higher education because of their interest in research and/or publication (31.6 percent) and few (14.6 percent) entered the field as a stepping stone to administrative positions.

TABLE 24

FACTORS HAVING THE GREATEST INFLUENCE ON A POSITION AT A STATE-OWNED INSTITUTION RATHER THAN A PRIVATE ONE

Factor	Frequency	Percent
Chance	311	44.2
Proximity to home	91	12.9
Educational background; support of public ed.	91	12.9
Good salary, working conditions, security	90	12.8
Husband's work	54	7.7
Job market	19	2.7
Other	48	6.8
Total	704	100.0

Chance, was the factor of greatest influence in the respondents being employed in a state-owned college rather than a private institution. Slightly more than one in five of the women in this group (21.2 percent) specifically stated that they had not sought the position; it had been offered to them.

Ninety-one women (12.9 percent) indicated that the proximity of the state-owned institution to their homes was

the prime reason for their choosing it instead of a private college. Closely allied to this reply was that given by 7.7 percent of the participants; namely, that their choice of positions was limited because of the location of their husband's work. As one woman succinctly stated:

> "I am at . . . because my husband's job is in this town. My location is completely dependent on his location."

Their own educational background in public institutions as well as their belief in public higher education influenced 12.9 percent of the women to choose a state-owned school. The following comments are illustrative of their viewpoint:

> "I was trained at a state-owned college and believe such an institution gives greater opportunities to greater numbers of students."

> "Attended state-owned institution and prefer the type of student which attends state-owned."

> "I graduated from the institution at which I am teaching. The students I teach come from backgrounds similar to my own. We understand each other."

State-owned institutions were viewed as having good working conditions and/or good salaries by 12.8 percent of the women. Almost two-thirds (63.0 percent) of these individuals specifically mentioned "salary" or "better pay" in expressing their reasons for having chosen a position in a public institution rather than a private one. Others alluded to the security of the state system. The following were typical of the comments made by this group of women.

> "They [the state college] paid more for my qualifications."

"I'd prefer to teach in an academically oriented private school but do not have the necessary doctorate. Here I have security of tenure without the doctorate."

"Most private colleges wouldn't hire women in the field of history (considered a man's field). State colleges . . . not being so popular with men would hire women with Ph. D's."

"Better salary; fringe benefits. Also, librarians have faculty status in the Pennsylvania state-owned colleges, whereas they do not in most private institutions."

"I have worked in both; organization, facilities, and salaries were better at this institution."

"At the time the state-owned institutions in the Mid-Atlantic states were offering higher salaries and I could not afford to work at a private institution."

Two percent of the women had experienced a tightening of the job market in their fields. Many of these reported that their presence at a state-owned institution was not due to preference but because an opening there was one of few available to them.

TABLE 25

FEELINGS CONCERNING PRESENT POSITION

Variable	Frequency	Percent
It is largely what I expected	377	51.7
It is better than I had expected	166	22.7
It is somewhat less than I had expected	187	25.6
Total	730	100.0

Slightly more than half of the women (51.7 percent) found their present positions largely what they had expected them to be. The remaining 49 percent were about equally

divided in finding the job somewhat better or less than had been expected, with the latter group being a little larger.

TABLE 26

REASONS GIVEN FOR FINDING PRESENT POSITION BETTER THAN HAD BEEN EXPECTED

Reasons	Frequency	Percent
Greater challenge	57	37.5
Greater academic freedom and opportunity to effect change	38	25.0
Better relationships with colleagues	27	17.8
Better students	17	11.2
Miscellaneous	13	8.5
Total	152	100.0

Those who found the job better did so primarily because they felt it more challenging (37.5 percent) and because they found more autonomy and opportunity to affect change than they had expected (25.0 percent). Friendlier, more helpful colleagues, and better students than had been anticipated were reported by 17.8 percent and 11.2 percent of the women. Six of the thirteen women in the last category indicated they had found salaries in their present positions to be better than they had expected.

TABLE 27

REASONS GIVEN FOR FINDING PRESENT POSITION LESS THAN HAD BEEN EXPECTED

Reasons	Frequency	Percent
Environment less stimulating than had been expected	33	18.6
Colleagues	26	14.7
Students	20	11.3
Institutional administration	19	10.7
State-college system	17	9.6
Miscellaneous	62	35.1
Total	177	100.0

Table 27 shows the reasons cited for finding the present position somewhat less than had been expected. More than one-third of the reasons were extremely varied, and, in the main, personal. None in this category was cited by 5 percent of the women. Some examples are: promotions based solely on degree, job insecurity because of present population and economic status, a poorly organized job, a job that had changed, personal conflict with a superior, lack of encouragement for academic research, long hours with accompanying emotional strain, slow promotions, salary drop from previous position, teaching outside major area, sex discrimination, too much time spent in "trivia," low regard by students and/or faculty for particular discipline, no time for research, or writing, or innovation.

Over eighteen percent (18.6 percent) of the disappointed found the intellectual environment less stimulating

than had been expected. Some reported a lack of challenge in their work and others deplored the fact that there was little or no opportunity to make decisions.

Their colleagues provided a source of disappointment to some of these women (14.7 percent). Prominent among the criticisms were the lack of community among faculty, the prevalence of in-fighting and campus politics, and a lack of professionalism.

Their students were a disappointment to other women (11.3 percent). The following comments illustrate their disillusionment:

> "Thought students would be more interested in an education."
>
> "I had expected better prepared students than I found."
>
> "Students have no respect for your knowledge."
>
> "Academic skill of students is poor."

Institutional administration was described by one in ten of the disappointed (10.7 percent) as being "irresponsible," "rigid," "authoritarian," and "inept." Others (9.6 percent) placed responsibility for their disappointment on the entire state system describing it as one without clearly defined goals, clogged by bureaucratic red tape and budgetary problems, and administered by individuals who were more "businessmen" than "educators."

TABLE 28

THREE REWARDS OF GREATEST VALUE RECEIVED FROM WORK

Reward	1*	%	2	%	3	%
The satisfaction gained from helping young people	422	57.1	176	23.8	61	8.3
The intellectual stimulation of the environment	149	20.2	279	37.8	111	15.0
The pay check	43	5.8	83	11.2	190	25.7
The prestige of the position	30	4.1	54	7.3	183	24.8
Contribution made to one's profession, school, or society	18	2.4	18	2.4	17	2.3
The challenge of the work itself	17	2.3	15	2.0	4	0.5
Opportunity to do research; perform; keep up in field	13	1.8	8	1.1	10	1.4
Academic freedom; independence of action	7	1.0	6	0.8	3	0.4
The opportunity to be creative; design new programs, etc.	5	0.7	7	1.0	4	0.5
Flexibility of schedule	5	0.7	7	1.0	8	1.1
Other	17	2.3	11	1.5	14	1.9

*1 equals highest value

To the women in this study the three most important rewards obtained from their work, ranked in order of their decreasing importance, are: (1) the satisfaction gained from helping young people, (2) the intellectual stimulation provided by the environment, and (3) the pay check.

More than half of the women in the study (57.1 percent) indicated that the satisfaction gained from helping young people was the greatest reward of their careers. One

in five (20.2 percent) reported that of utmost importance to them was the intellectual stimulation provided by the environment of higher education. Of the many additional rewards mentioned, none was considered of greatest value by as many as 10 percent of the group.

As is apparent in Table 28, the distinction as to which reward is considered of secondary importance is not as obvious as it was in the case of the one having greatest value. Although the intellectual stimulation of the environment was of secondary importance to the greatest number of women, this accounted for only 37.8 percent of the group. Two other rewards were considered of secondary importance to sizable numbers of women. These were the satisfaction gained from helping young people, indicated by 23.8 percent; and the pay check, similarly ranked by 11.2 percent.

The pay check was most frequently marked as third in importance by approximately one-fourth of the participants, (25.7 percent). However, the prestige of the position was ranked third by an almost equal percentage of the group (24.8 percent). An additional 15 percent ranked the intellectual stimulation of the environment as their third most valued reward.

TABLE 29

RESPONDENTS' ASPIRATIONS CONCERNING OTHER POSITIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Administration	89	33.8
Another institution	55	20.9
Higher rank	32	12.2
A teaching position	30	11.4
Miscellaneous	57	21.7
Total	263	100.0

When asked if they had aspirations of holding another position in higher education, 36.4 percent of the respondents replied affirmatively. Not all individuals indicated the positions they desired.

Approximately one-third (33.8 percent) showed preference for administrative work. Among this group were three who desire to be college presidents.

A substantial number of women (20.9 percent) indicated a desire to move to other institutions. Although most of these were explicit in their desire to do so, others implied as much with comments such as: "where I can teach more specialized courses," "where more time is allotted to creative activity," "where more time is allowed for research."

Other participants (12.2 percent) wish a higher rank than they are presently holding or they wish to relinquish administrative responsibilities to return to the classroom on a full-time basis (11.4 percent).

Of those in the "miscellaneous" category, approximately one-fourth were women who want to be employed on a permanent basis. Others aspire to graduate teaching, positions in student personnel and/or counseling, or desire to expand the programs in which they are presently teaching.

TABLE 30

REASONS FOR RESPONDENTS NOT WANTING ANOTHER POSITION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Satisfaction with current position	333	73.7
No added or new responsibilities desired	30	6.7
Lack qualifications for another position	20	4.4
Sex discrimination would preclude positions other than teaching	12	2.7
No desire to learn new position	3	.7
Miscellaneous	53	11.8
Total	451	100.0

Chief among the reasons for not desiring another position was that the respondents find the work they are currently engaged in both satisfying and challenging (73.7 percent). Less than 15 percent felt they lacked qualifications for another position, did not want to submit to the rigor of learning a new position, did not want new responsibilities, or felt that sex discrimination would preclude their being given serious consideration for a position other than teaching. Of the 53 respondents in the "Miscellaneous"

group, 32 (60.4 percent) gave their age and proximity to retirement as the primary reason for not desiring a job change. Others replied that they were either leaving higher education or were investigating other careers, that not having a doctorate gave them doubts about finding as good a position as they now had, that marriage precluded a change from their present institution.

TABLE 31

FACTORS CAUSING GREATEST DISSATISFACTION WITH CAREER CHOICE

Factor	Frequency	Percent
Organization and administration of higher education	160	32.0
Climate of higher education	56	11.2
Colleagues	54	10.8
Career demands	51	10.2
Discrimination and/or role conflict	50	10.0
Students	33	6.6
Low status of field work	24	4.8
Other	72	14.4
Total	500	100.0

When asked to report the source of greatest dissatisfaction in their careers, one-third of the women either did not reply or indicated that they had none. Typical replies of those citing a major source may be found in Appendix G.

Most frequently the greatest dissatisfaction came from the administration and organization of higher education.

Thirty-two percent of the respondents cited this as the source of their discontent. Although much criticism was directed at inept institutional leadership, the lack of autonomy and the bureaucratic entanglements caused by state control also came under fire. Within this same area, others were disgruntled with the many non-teaching responsibilities which pre-empt their time and energy. Disenchantment was also cited with a system in which advancement is primarily dependent upon the attainment of academic degrees and the accumulation of credit hours, in which classrooms are overloaded, where pay is low, and where collective bargaining is a fact of life.

Eleven percent of the respondents found to their dissatisfaction a "climate" in higher education which does not foster creativity or change; one which lacks intellectual stimulation and is fraught with politics; and one in which job security is diminishing.

Their colleagues were the greatest source of dissatisfaction to one in ten (10.8 percent) of the women. Fellow professors were described as immature, unprofessional, uncooperative, petty, apathetic, and lacking in commitment to their profession.

Another 10 percent of the participants had experienced discrimination and/or role conflict in their careers. Although the former was the main source of their dissatisfaction, comments were also made on the conflict encountered in combining a career and family; the prejudice found against

married women; and on their own ambivalent feelings about acquiring equal status and responsibility with men.

Yet another 10 percent of the women resented the demands that their careers make on their personal lives.

For 6 percent of the participants career disenchantment was student-centered. Although most of these women lamented a lack of intellectual curiosity on the part of their students; some expressed anxiety over the responsibility of evaluating student work. Others were doubtful that their efforts were producing desired behavioral changes.

Twenty-four individuals (4.8 percent) indicated disappointment with the status accorded them or their fields. Eight different areas were mentioned. However, three-fourths of these respondents were concentrated in three programs. Librarians sensed a low regard of the faculty for their professional status and the role of the library in the instructional program. Women in health and physical education were not only very sensitive to the second place status accorded their program when compared to men's, but were also concerned with society's low regard for health education. Finally, nurses were anxious about the poor public image of nursing as a career and its low regard among the academic community as an intellectual science.

The "Other" replies indicated dissatisfaction stemming from personal factors or those inherent in a particular position.

TABLE 32

EQUALITY OF MALE/FEMALE STATUS ON CAMPUS

Statements	True	%	Untrue	%
Women are not given enough representation in administrative positions on the campus	552	83.8	107	16.2
Women are not given enough representation on school-wide policy-making committees	386	59.8	260	40.2
Not enough women faculty are hired	371	60.1	246	39.9
Although qualified, women are not promoted as quickly as men	300	52.8	268	47.2
Women do not aspire to holding administrative positions	280	51.0	269	49.0
Nepotism restrictions preclude the employment of some women	171	30.2	396	69.8
Women are not given equal pay with men	162	27.6	424	72.4

Included in the questionnaire were seven statements relevant to the equality of male and female status in higher education. The respondents were asked to indicate whether or not in their opinions each of these statements was true of their particular campus. Each statement that was marked "true" was an indication that, in the opinion of the respondent, women on her campus did not enjoy equal status with men. On the whole the frequency of statements marked "true" exceeded those marked "untrue" by 252 (6.0 percent).

As is evident from Table 32 there was strong feeling (83.8 percent) that women are not given enough representation at the administrative levels of their institutions. In addition, the respondents were under the impression that insufficient women are hired for professional positions

(60.1 percent), and that women are not given enough representation on school-wide policy-making committees (59.8 percent). In contrast, most participants were not aware of salary inequity, if in fact it exists; nor did many view nepotism restrictions as a problem for women securing employment. The margin between those who felt women were not promoted as quickly as men and those who did was small (5.6 percent) but in favor of non-promotion. As to whether women aspired to administrative positions, the group was again about evenly divided with a 2 percent margin favoring the belief that they do not desire those positions.

It is interesting to note the range in the numbers of women reacting to each of these statements. The two statements concerning female representation in administrative positions and on campus-wide committees elicited responses from 89.2 percent and 87.4 percent of the women. Reactions to the statement concerning women's aspirations for administrative positions and that regarding nepotism restrictions were given by only 74.3 percent and 76.7 percent of the total respondents.

TABLE 33

RANKS FOR WHICH PROMOTION WAS DENIED

Rank	Frequency	Percent
Professor	30	35.3
Associate professor	38	44.7
Assistant professor	17	20.0
Total	85	100.0

Six hundred forty-three women (87.0 percent) reported that they had never been denied promotions for which they were qualified. Most of the denials were for associate or full professorships.

Five percent of those refused promotion either had not been given any official reason for denial or were the victims of budgetary restrictions and filled quotas. The remainder were given a variety of reasons. The most frequently cited were a lack of seniority or that the applicant did not possess a doctorate. It is obvious from some of the comments that in the respondents' minds many of the reasons were unsatisfactory and discriminatory.

> "Was on leave, so must wait. But several men in same situation received promotion."
>
> "Suddenly only tenured people were eligible."
>
> "Our department committee does not believe in promotion to professor without doctorate."
>
> "A man with a family received it."
>
> "'Is not ready' (Given by Department chairman, who was overruled because of his personal--not sexist--bias.)"
>
> "No doctorate, though legally the doctorate is not a requirement and several men are associate and even full professors without it."
>
> "Not <u>enrolled</u> in a doctoral program."
>
> "Anything from not having completed my doctorate to being a radical and/or feminist."
>
> "None - files were misplaced."
>
> "It was laughable. I would have topped the department chairman."

TABLE 34

WOULD YOU ENCOURAGE YOUNG WOMEN TO CHOOSE HIGHER EDUCATION AS A VOCATION?

Answer	Frequency	Percent
Yes	610	82.9
No	19	2.6
Uncertain	107	14.5
Total	736	100.0

Most of the participants (82.9 percent) would encourage young women to choose a career in higher education. More showed uncertainty of their actions (14.5 percent) than were definitely against such encouragement (2.6 percent).

TABLE 35

REASONS FOR NEGATIVE OR UNCERTAIN REACTION TO ENCOURAGING YOUNG WOMEN TO CHOOSE CAREERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Reason	Frequency	Percent
Poor job market	47	42.4
Depends upon the woman	30	27.0
Other more challenging careers available	11	9.9
Discrimination will persist	11	9.9
Miscellaneous	12	10.8
Total	111	100.0

Chief among the reasons for a negative or uncertain reply was the poor job market today in higher education (42.4

percent). Another group of substantial size (27.0 percent) replied that encouragement would depend entirely upon the young woman involved. Others showed reservation primarily because, in their opinions, sex discrimination will persist and because there are many more challenging and lucrative opportunities available to women today. The following comments typify the reticence of some of the respondents:

> "I would recommend it only to someone who was somewhat aggressive and certain of her ability."
>
> "Would encourage only an exceptionally gifted woman and would warn her of difficulties."
>
> "If absolutely committed to this type of teaching and if content to remain in lower echelons."
>
> "Not unless they were aggressive enough and mentally stable enough to take the terrific 'in-fighting' which characterizes my job here."
>
> "Education is too much a target for society's firing line."

TABLE 36

THE EFFECT OF BEING A WOMAN IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Effect	Frequency	Percent
Advantageous	102	14.0
Disadvantageous	90	12.3
Both advantageous and disadvantageous	342	46.8
Neither advantageous nor disadvantageous	197	26.9
Total	731	100.0

Although a sizable number (26.9 percent) of the respondents felt that their sex had had no effect on their

careers, most frequently women felt that being female had been both an advantage and a disadvantage (46.8 percent). The remaining women were about evenly divided in the opinion that their sex had been a decided advantage or disadvantage to them.

TABLE 37

WHY RESPONDENTS FOUND BEING FEMALE ADVANTAGEOUS TO THEM IN THEIR PROFESSION

Reason	Frequency	Percent
They are in traditionally female fields	84	42.0
They recognize the potential of affirmative action programs	54	27.0
They use their "femininity" to gain advantage	29	14.5
Miscellaneous reasons	33	16.5
Total	200	100.0

Forty-two percent of the women pointed out that because they had entered traditionally "female" fields their sex had been to their advantage. This group was comprised of personnel in elementary education, home economics, physical education and of librarians. It should also be pointed out that many of the women in these same fields gave evidence of disillusionment at having little opportunity after initial entry for decision-making or positions of added responsibility.

> "I feel that being a woman has not been disadvantageous to my career; my aspirations are limited by my own

choice. However, the fact that every one of the chief librarians of the Pennsylvania State Colleges is a man must indicate prejudice in a field where so many members are women."

"Men, especially in librarianship, are chosen for administrative positions."

"Traditionally women have been the majority of employees in the profession. An increase in men has most frequently been at the administrative level." (A librarian)

"Being female and a nurse is an advantage; but men with my education progress faster."

"One is expected to teach, not administrate; to serve on committees, not chair them." (Elementary Education)

Some of the respondents (27.0 percent) were aware that affirmative action programs are creating a climate in higher education that is advantageous to women.

"A woman was wanted for my position; therefore, I received it over more credentialed and experienced men."

"Have gotten involved in campus politics and committees . . . so few women that you are 'token' everything. If you're good, you can have whatever you please."

"It helped me get hired, which I both appreciated and resented."

"Recently have been put on committees and offered jobs because I am a woman."

"Women are now being encouraged to enter higher education. I seem to be somewhat sought after because I am both female and black!"

Almost fifteen percent of the women (14.5 percent) indicated that they had deliberately used their femininity to seek advantage when necessary.

"I confess to using 'feminine' tactics where and when necessary which has been advantageous."

"Advantageous to manipulate males through normal male-female inter-action. I can always get my male boss to do what I want."

"I resent comments of 'so they finally hired a good looker,' but find the strategy helpful to meet my goals."

"Whenever it is to my advantage to be the 'womanly' woman, I am. When sex is a disadvantage, I fight."

A few examples of the advantages included in the "Miscellaneous" grouping are: that women felt higher education recognized a need for women in order to provide role models for female students, that they found a "woman's" viewpoint welcome, that women received special considerations not accorded men, and that they had chosen academic areas in which women were not prevalent. One woman cited to her advantage the fact that she "could take chances with no fear of failure, since success is not required of women."

The prevalence of sexist attitudes and sex discrimination in higher education was the theme in almost 9 in 10 (88.4 percent) of the <u>disadvantages</u> cited by the respondents. Women stated that they had received promotions more slowly than had men; that they performed the same work for less pay; and that men received preferential treatment in such areas as class scheduling, summer school contracts, and coaching assignments. They also felt that they had to work harder than their male colleagues in order to prove their competency; that they had been treated condescendingly; and that male superiority was assumed. The following comments illustrate these views.

"I'm not taken seriously until someone wants a tedious job done."

"Disadvantages in this position seem to result from lack of communication with administrators, lack of involvement in policy making and unfair distribution of loads and interesting courses."

"Men get professional directorships and promotions prior to women."

"Higher quality and more work is expected of women--women with more experience and a higher degree are threatening to some people."

"I feel that I have frequently been treated paternally or condescendingly solely because of my sex."

Comments such as the following typify the replies of many respondents concerning the disadvantaged position of women's programs in physical education.

"Men are hired as coaches, even when a woman is needed to fill a teaching position."

". . .discrimination in terms of salary, facilities, program extensiveness runs rampant in this field. . ."

"Discrimination occurs in scheduling of facilities and budget for athletic teams."

"In physical education women have always been discriminated against with regard to equipment, supplies, coaching priorities for girls' teams, salaries for coaching, etc."

Male control has created pessimism among some as to whether women really have viable opportunities for policy-making or administrative roles in higher education.

"Qualified women are not voted in chairmanship positions by male peers."

"I have never had any aspirations to be an administrator but I can see there seems to be a problem there."

"As a woman, you are allowed to plan and execute day-to-day work, but policy-making and long-range decisions are reserved for men."

"Decisions are made for nursing faculty by men in administration and other men faculty members who are outside nursing profession."

". . .under present conditions (faculty selection, low percentage of women) there is almost no chance for women administrators."

"Women here are seldom elected to important committees."

"Now that we have many new faculty additions and a greater number of younger men in the department vying for tenure, promotion, and merit increases: nominations and voting seem to favor the men who must make it here since the opportunity for other positions in other institutions is not encouraging."

Other participants suggested that, because of the preponderance of males in higher education, being female had limited their effectiveness in the informal organization of their institutions as well as with their students.

"I also suspect that the social limitations of being a woman have closed useful avenues of communication to me."

". . .I have to make a concerted effort to crack the camaraderie of 'the boys' in order to be counted in the informal decision-making patterns."

"Men entering the department are brought along by the chairman, given responsibilities and new courses, encouraged to get doctorates, etc. Women are relatively ignored and are even overlooked for courses they are qualified to teach."

"Students don't always respect a female instructor as much . . ."

"I have on occasion felt a disputed point in class would be more quickly accepted if a male professor made the statement."

Most of the other disadvantages cited by the respondents concerned stereotyped role behavior. Some women lamented their own lack of aggressiveness which they recognized as being desirable to take a leadership role in the

profession. Others criticized societal attitudes that women "should be seen and not heard" or that women "belong in the home." Married women felt that they were not accorded professional status by men or single women.

As was previously mentioned, more than one in four women were confident that their sex had had no effect on their careers. Their comments reflect satisfaction and pride in the knowledge that they have been accepted as professionals and that their productivity has been evaluated on its own merits, without sexual bias:

> "All members of our department are treated equally. Each person is an individual judged on his ability."
>
> "I believe I've been treated as any other individual, based solely on results produced by my efforts."
>
> "I'm being judged on my job competency, not on the nature of my sex."
>
> "I have had requests considered fairly. I have no reason to believe that I have been denied a position or placed in a position because of my sex."

TABLE 38

OVER-ALL SATISFACTION WITH PRESENT CAREER IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Rating	Frequency	Percent
Very dissatisfied	19	2.6
Dissatisfied	43	5.9
Indifferent	31	4.3
Satisfied	406	55.7
Very satisfied	229	31.5
Total	728	100.0

In rating the over-all satisfaction with their present career in higher education, almost 90 percent of the respondents (87.2 percent) reported that they were either satisfied or very satisfied with their careers.

TABLE 39

MEANS BY WHICH INSTITUTIONS CAN BEST MEET THE NEEDS OF THEIR FEMALE FACULTY

Item	Frequency	Percent
Place more in administration	143	33.7
Rely on quality of performance for the evaluation of all faculty	74	17.5
Hire more	57	13.4
Eliminate sexism	35	8.3
Implement affirmative action programs	20	4.7
Give encouragement to their professional development	16	3.8
Give encouragement to female faculty to organize	15	3.5
Miscellaneous	64	15.1
Total	424	100.0

In the final question respondents were asked to indicate one way in which they felt their institutions could best meet the needs of their female faculty.

The suggestions that are summarized in Table 39 were made by approximately 57 percent of the women.

In the opinion of almost two-thirds of the respondents (64.6 percent) institutions can help in three ways: (1) by placing qualified women in positions where they will participate in decision-making and the formulation of policy,

(2) by evaluating all faculty on the quality of their performance and accomplishment without regard to sex, and (3) by hiring more women to faculty positions.

As in the case of the previous questions, the replies revealed an awareness that many of the problems faced by women in higher education are caused by societal attitudes toward women, in general.

> "It appears the institution shares a typical acultured view of men as doers and women as appendages. Unconsciously they just do not think about women in considering tasks, new positions, etc."

> "Overcoming the European concept of women's services in the kitchen/bedroom is difficult in Pennsylvania."

As a result, 8.3 percent of the women urged their institutions to become aware of their sexist attitudes and policies and to eliminate sexism wherever it exists within the system.

Institutions were also urged to fully implement their existing affirmative action programs (4.7 percent) and to encourage women to seek personal and professional growth by providing them with information on grants, fellowships, management training seminars etc. (3.8 percent).

Three and one-half percent of the participants felt that more interaction among women was needed in order to discuss common problems and strategies for their solution.

About one in five suggestions in the last grouping concerned the need for physical facilities for women faculty. Lounges, dining rooms, and athletic facilities comparable to those available to male faculty members were suggested.

Greater flexibility with regard to maternity leaves, work schedules allowing for a career and the raising of a family, child-care facilities, part-time positions with tenure, and a review of all professional salaries in order to equalize payment for position and experience were other suggestions in this category.

Some of the respondents indicated that female needs were not different from those of male faculty and that their particular institution needed to better meet the needs of all. More than one individual shared the feeling of the woman who suggested "that male/female tags be forgotten and institutions consider the individual and how the needs of the individual [can] be met to improve the 'quality of life.'"

A secondary problem in this study was to show relationships among certain of the variables. Since it was assumed that information from this study would be of benefit to career counselors and women contemplating careers in higher education, assessment of satisfaction with career choice was cross-tabulated with certain other variables thought to reveal information of value to these two groups.

In the main, the responses indicating over-all satisfaction with a career in higher education were divided into three categories: (1) very dissatisfied and dissatisfied, (2) indifferent, (3) satisfied and very satisfied. These three areas were then cross-tabulated with certain of the other variables. Chi square values were computed in each

case. In four instances, when it was apparent that the chi squares were unduly inflated by extremely low expected frequencies, the "indifferent" responses were combined with those of the "dissatisfied" and "very dissatisfied." Table 40 shows the chi square values obtained.

Following the table is discussion concerning those relationships for which a significant chi square at either the 5 percent or 1 percent level was found. Contingency tables for these relationships are located in Appendices H through R.

TABLE 40

CHI SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY SATISFACTION WITH CAREER CHOICE AND CERTAIN OTHER VARIABLES

Variable	Degrees of Freedom	Chi Square
Age	8	7.5286
Time at which first consideration was given to career	4	.5695
Highest level of education	2	2.5491
Current rank	4	2.8287
Number of years in higher education	2	2.9207
Number of years at current institution	2	3.3172
Description of work	4	8.5583
Academic area	8	9.8644
Influences of selected factors on choice of career:		
Expected intellectual challenge	4	7.1585
Interest in working with youth of college age	2	7.8786**

Variable	Degrees of Freedom	Chi Square
Value of career to society	4	12.2294**
Influence of a teacher, parent, or some other person	4	8.1054
Opportunity to advance to an administrative post	4	5.9219
Opportunity to do research and/or publish	4	5.7541
Good working conditions and/or good pay	4	5.9745
Chance	4	2.0191
Three rewards of greatest value received from work	8	9.7414
Expectations concerning present position	4	148.7181*
Aspirations concerning other positions in higher education	2	17.4237*
Factor of greatest dissatisfaction in career choice	12	16.9484
Reactions to statements concerning status of women on respondents' campus:		
Women are not given enough representation on policy-making committees	2	16.3284*
Women are not given equal pay with men	2	11.2394*
Women are not given enough representation in administration	2	7.2579**
Nepotism restrictions preclude employment of some women	2	12.8481*
Not enough women are hired	2	9.0256*
Women are not promoted as quickly as men	2	23.0424*
Women do not aspire to holding administrative positions	2	3.8289
Effect on career of being female	3	66.8574*

* equals $p < .01$
** equals $p < .05$

The Influences of Selected Factors on Choice of Career

As Table 40 reveals, two factors of influence disclosed significant chi square values at the 5 percent level when cross-tabulated with career satisfaction. The first of these was the respondents' interest in working with youth of college age. From Appendix H it can be determined that the significance of the chi square is due largely to the responses of those who are indifferent or dissatisfied with their careers. Fewer of these women than should be expected ranked this factor of high importance and more than should be expected ranked it of little or no importance.

Also revealing a significant chi square value at the 5 percent level were the responses concerning the importance of the value of the career to society (Appendix I). The reported frequencies of those who are indifferent or dissatisfied and weighing this factor of little or no importance in their career decision were greater than should be expected. In addition, the low frequencies among the dissatisfieds who thought this factor to be important and the low frequencies among the indifferents who thought this factor to be highly important in their career choice contributed substantially to the chi square.

Expectations Concerning Present Position

As Appendix J illustrates, the chi square found in this cross-tabulation is largely due to the excess of observed over expected frequencies of those indifferent and dissatisfied with their careers and who reported their

present positions somewhat less than they had expected. In addition, the low frequencies of those who are satisfied but finding the current position less than had been expected and those who are dissatisfied but finding the position better than had been expected contributed relatively large portions of the chi square.

Aspirations Concerning Other Positions in Higher Education

Appendix K reveals that virtually 70 percent of the chi square value found in this cross-tabulation (significant at the 1 percent level) was contributed by those who reported some dissatisfaction with their careers. More of these women tended to have aspirations for other positions than would be expected in a normal distribution. Although the same trend was noted among those who are indifferent, the individual chi squares did not contribute substantially to the over-all value.

Those who reported at least some satisfaction with their careers tended not to have aspirations of other positions. However, again the values did not contribute substantially to the over-all chi square.

Among those who were indifferent, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied were sixteen women who desire positions at other institutions. Two of these indicated a preference of a private school; two, for a large college or university; and one, for a position in another state. Next in order of frequency were thirteen women who desire administrative or decision-making positions. Several of these indicated aspir-

ations for collegiate vice presidencies or deanships. Five desired a higher rank; five, full-time employment; four, full-time teaching without administrative responsibilities; and three, graduate teaching and/or research.

Reactions to Statements Concerning the Status of Women on Respondents' Campus

Of the seven statements concerning the status of women on their respective campuses, all but one revealed significant chi squares when cross-tabulated with degree of career satisfaction. There was no significant relationship revealed by the statement, "Women do not aspire to holding administrative positions." With the exception of the chi square obtained for the statement, "Women are not given enough representation in administrative positions on the campus," all of the values were significant at the 1 percent level. The latter statement was significant at the 5 percent level.

Appendices L through Q reveal that for each statement the responses of those who are dissatisfied with their careers contributed substantial portions of the total chi square. In each case more of these women thought the statement applied to their campuses than should be expected in a normal distribution of responses. Conversely fewer "no" responses were recorded than would be expected.

In the case of the statement concerning the slowness of promotions among women, the dissatisfieds again reacted with more "yes" responses than would be expected. However,

almost half of the chi square value came from those who described themselves as "indifferent" toward their careers. These women responded with more affirmative and fewer negative replies than should be expected (Appendix Q).

In all instances the responses of the women who claimed at least some satisfaction with their careers were more inclined to be negative, indicating that they did not feel the status of women on their campuses was disparate with that of their male colleagues. However, the differences between expected and recorded responses to each statement did not contribute substantially to the chi square values.

Effect on Career of Being Female

Almost all of the chi square (significant at the 1 percent level) found in this cross-tabulation was contributed by the responses of those citing dissatisfaction or indifference with their careers. More of these women felt their sex had been disadvantageous to them than would be expected. Fewer of this group thought their sex had been an advantage and fewer thought that it had been neither an advantage or disadvantage.

Those claiming satisfaction were more inclined to think that their sex had been both an advantage and a disadvantage to them and less disposed to think it had been solely disadvantageous. (Appendix R)

VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary and Conclusions

This study was designed to describe the female faculty in the fourteen state-owned colleges and university of Pennsylvania and to ascertain relationships among certain specific variables.

To achieve these purposes, a questionnaire was designed to elicit responses from the women concerning their personal background; their academic status, preparation, and work experience; their attitudes and satisfactions concerning their careers; their professional responsibility and involvement in certain types of professional activity.

The questionnaires were sent to 1,187 women holding academic rank as of October 31, 1973, in the fourteen state-owned colleges and university of Pennsylvania. From this group eighty-nine individuals were eliminated either because they were no longer employed by the institution or were currently on leave. Of the 742 questionnaires returned, 739 (67.6 percent) were used in the study.

Most of the women who participated in this research are natives of Pennsylvania or one of its bordering states. Although both of their parents characteristically had at least ten to twelve years of schooling, 40 percent of both parents had received some education beyond the secondary

school level. Most of their fathers had been employed either in skilled/semi-skilled or professional/technical occupations.

A family of two children and a husband who is engaged in professional/technical work is characteristic of the married women. This group slightly exceeded in number those who are unmarried. Half of the women are less than forty-three years of age and about one in five combines her career with raising children of elementary and/or secondary school age.

It was typical for these women to have taken some graduate work beyond their master's degrees. A substantial number reported having taken work within the past five years. Many indicated that they had completed all of the course work toward a doctorate. One in four had earned that degree. In most cases, the doctorate had been conferred by a public institution outside Pennsylvania. Almost forty-two percent of the women without doctorates indicated, either implicitly or explicitly, that to them the degree had little or no value.

Among the women there appeared to be no consensus as to when in their own educational experience they even tentatively gave thought to a career in higher education.

Characteristically, in her current position, a respondent held the rank of assistant professor and worked under a nine- or ten-month full-time contract for a salary of $14,000 to $16,999. Frequently she began college teaching after having been employed in an elementary and/or secondary school.

It was not unusual for her present employer to be the only four-year institution of higher education to have employed her on a full-time basis. The duration of her employment in higher education was typically from five to nine years, the median being eight years. Her current employer had usually employed her for five years or less.

Although career interruptions were not typical, they were experienced by a little more than one-third of the group. Childbirth and care or graduate study were the usual causes. Slightly less than one-third of the women had held positions outside the field of education for at least one year since receiving their baccalaureate degrees.

Most of the participants held teaching positions at their institutions; some combined this activity with other major responsibilities. Very few were in the top management levels of their schools. No titles reported were indicative of higher-level positions than that of "dean". This title was held by only ten individuals, five of whom were in the area of student affairs. It was more characteristic of the group to hold titles of "assistant" and "associate" than those of "chairperson", or "director", or "coordinator."

Of those who teach, 38 percent were in the academic areas of nursing, health, physical education, and the humanities. Another 29 percent taught in the social sciences and elementary and early childhood education.

More than half of the group reported doing some research within the past five years. This research was usually

not conducted as a requirement for a degree nor was it published. It was exceptional for the women to have engaged in consultative work or to have written for publication. As might be expected, most of the writing done was professional in nature.

Although within the past five years over half of the women had served on institutional-wide committees, few had chaired committees. Most of their experience was in the areas of curriculum and faculty affairs. Proportionately, few had served on committees concerned with institutional development, finance, long-range planning, the selection of administrative personnel, freshmen orientation, student recruitment, athletics, continuing education, and equal opportunity.

The participants had embarked upon careers in higher education primarily because of intrinsic factors. Their interest in working with students of college age and the expected intellectual challenge of the work were most frequently cited as having been of importance in their career decision.

In ranking the rewards proffered by their careers the most frequently mentioned as having the greatest value was the satisfaction gained from helping young people. Second and third in importance were the intellectual stimulation received from the environment and the pay check. Mentioned almost as frequently as the latter was the prestige of the position.

Of those who indicated a major source of dissatis-

faction in their careers, not quite one-third cited the organization and administration of higher education. This was the single most frequently cited factor. Virtually all other sources of dissatisfaction were rather evenly distributed among five areas: (1) their colleagues, (2) sex discrimination and/or role conflict, (3) the climate of higher education, (4) the demands of the career, and (5) other factors which were either personal to the individual or peculiar to the position she currently holds.

Although their presence at a state-owned institution was more a matter of chance than design, most of the respondents found their positions to be largely what they had expected. More than one-third of the reasons given by the one in four who were disappointed were so disparate as to defy generalization. Those who found the position better than their expectations did so primarily because of its challenge.

When reacting to specific statements concerning the equality of status between male and female faculty on their respective campuses, the overall response was somewhat negative--though not strongly in that direction. The area in which the response was overwhelmingly negative was that of the representation of women in administrative positions. Respondents also indicated, with less pronouncement, that they did not think enough women were hired to faculty positions; that women were not given enough representation on school-wide policy-making committees; that, although

qualified, women were not promoted as quickly as men; and that women do not aspire to holding administrative positions. (The group later bore out the validity of this observation when asked about their own career aspirations.) In contrast, their responses indicate that they do not feel the fourteen institutions have nepotism restrictions nor salary inequality based on sex.

Very few women reported that they had been denied a promotion for which they were qualified. However, it was not uncommon for those who had been denied promotions to indicate that the official reason given to them was unsatisfactory, discriminatory, or lacking in validity.

Two-thirds of the participants did not aspire to other positions within higher education. The principal reason given was that they found their current work satisfying. Most of those who desire a change either wish to assume administrative work or positions at other institutions.

When asked to rate their over-all satisfaction with a career in higher education, almost nine in ten women were either "satisfied" or "very satisfied." It is not surprising then to find that most of them (82.9 percent) would encourage young women to choose similar careers.

In the opinion of almost half of the respondents, being female had proven to be <u>both</u> advantageous and disadvantageous to their careers. Not quite half that number felt that their sex had been <u>neither</u> an advantage nor a disadvantage to them. The principal advantage cited of being a

female was that the respondent had entered a traditionally "female" field. The principal disadvantage given was sex bias and discrimination.

Most of the women observed that their institutions could best meet the needs of female faculty by (1) placing more of them in administrative positions, (2) relying on quality of performance for evaluation of all faculty, and (3) hiring more women for faculty positions.

When asked to indicate the influence of certain factors on their choice of a career, two factors bore significant relationships with career satisfaction. Women who claimed indifference or dissatisfaction with their careers were inclined to rate their interest in working with college age youth of little or no importance in their decision. Furthermore, this same group tended to rate the value of the career to society as having been of little or no importance in their choice of a career.

Expectations concerning their present positions also related significantly to their degree of satisfaction with career choice. This is not surprising when one considers that for many of these women the current position is the only one they have held in higher education. Those who were dissatisfied or indifferent concerning their careers tended to report their present positions somewhat less than had been expected, whereas few of those who were satisfied made this observation.

Another significant relationship was found between

aspirations for another position in higher education and career satisfaction. For the most part, those who desired changes were the same women who showed some dissatisfaction with their careers. Approximately 44 percent of that group desire positions at other institutions; 36 percent desire positions in the administration of higher education.

The reactions of the respondents to statements concerning the status of women on their own campuses revealed that, in general, those who were dissatisfied with their careers tended to feel that women did not have equal status with men. Only the reaction to one statement, "Women do not aspire to holding administrative positions," did not carry a significant relationship to career satisfaction.

Finally, it was found that the women who were indifferent or dissatisfied with their careers were more apt to feel that their sex had been a disadvantage to them. Those who were satisfied tended to think that their sex had been both an advantage and a disadvantage to them.

B. Recommendations

The women in this survey have indicated with minimal exception that they find their present careers in higher education at least satisfactory. Inasmuch as approximately three in five of the women have taught in only one four-year institution of higher education, an assessment of their careers is in effect an assessment of a career in one of Pennsylvania's state-owned institutions of higher education.

Even among the "satisfied," the data reveal respondents who found their careers influenced by their sex; women who indicated that on the fourteen campuses the status of women differed from that of men; women who reported experiences of sexual bias in their present positions. Thus, it must be concluded that the over-all assessment of their careers is more an indication of their adjustment to the system than of the system's responsiveness to the needs of women as individuals.

To minimize the dissatisfactions cited by the participants in this study and to maximize the utilization of the talent which these women represent, the following recommendations are offered:

(1) That qualified women be recruited by these institutions for top-level decision-making positions and for lesser positions which have the potential for advancement in the administrative hierarchy.

(2) That these institutions seek out those of their own female faculty who are interested in administrative positions and actively assist these women in the fulfillment of their aspirations.

(3) That management conferences and seminars for women in higher education be conducted by the Department of Education, or the institutions, in order that women may increase their potential and self-confidence for assuming decision-making positions.

(4) That all segments of the institutions make an

effort to obtain greater participation by women in institutional-wide committees and that steps be taken to insure that women faculty are represented on all committees.

(5) That these institutions encourage their female faculty to take an active role in campus affirmative action programs and women's caucuses.

(6) That these institutions demonstrate their commitment to equal opportunity by immediately reviewing for inequities, and misconceptions of such, the salaries, ranks, and appointments of all women faculty.

(7) That all persons with responsibility for the guidance and education of women desiring careers in higher education urge these women to obtain for themselves that preparation which will give them the best credentials and allow them to be truly competitive with their male colleagues.

(8) That the Department of Public Education, the Pennsylvania State Education Association, the Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties, and the administrative officers of the fourteen institutions review the findings of this study and give immediate priority to improving the status of women faculty and to lessening the dissatisfactions cited by these women.

(9) That the status and attitudes of women employed in higher education in the state-owned institutions be continually studied in order to evaluate the improvement which has taken place and assess the need for further change.

(10) That the status, motivation, and attitudes of

women employed in higher education be continually studied in order to provide timely information concerning careers in higher education for women.

By improving the status and utilization of women faculty in its four-year institutions of higher education, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will improve the productivity and effectiveness of the institutions involved and further its commitment to excellence in its educational system.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

No 3 95

FACULTY WOMEN QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate your answers to the following questions. Most of the information sought can be indicated by short answers or a check mark. In order to add clarity, provide example, give additional information or personal opinion, please use the last page of the questionnaire.

PERSONAL BACKGROUND

1. Where were you born? ..... (State or Country, if other than U.S.)
2. What is/was your father's principal occupation? .....
3. What was the highest level of your father's education?
   ..... less than 6 years ..... 10-12 years ..... college (baccalaureate)
   ..... 6-9 years ..... college (less than a baccalaureate) ..... post-baccalaureate work
4. What was the highest level of your mother's education?
   ..... less than 6 years ..... 10-12 years ..... college (baccalaureate)
   ..... 6-9 years ..... college (less than a baccalaureate) ..... post-baccalaureate work
5. Are you currently ..... married? ..... divorced? ..... separated? ..... unmarried? ..... widowed?
6. How many children do you have? ..... How many in elementary or secondary school? .....
7. If you are currently married, what is your husband's principal occupation? .....
8. What was your age on your last birthday? .....
9. When did you, even tentatively, consider higher education as a career choice?
   ..... before receiving your baccalaureate degree
   ..... after receiving your baccalaureate but before receiving a master's degree
   ..... after receiving your master's degree

ACADEMIC PREPARATION, STATUS, AND PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE

10. Check the highest level of your formal education.
    ..... Bachelor's Degree ..... Doctorate
    ..... Master's Degree ..... Post-doctoral work
    ..... Work beyond master's but no doctorate ..... Other ..... (Please Specify)
11. Indicate by check mark the location and kind of institution at which you obtained each of your degrees.

	In Pa.	Outside Pa.	Public	Private
Bachelor's	.....	.....	.....	.....
Master's	.....	.....	.....	.....
Doctorate	.....	.....	.....	.....

12. Please indicate the year in which you completed your most recent graduate credits. 19.....
13. What is your current rank? ..... prof. ..... assoc. prof. ..... asst. prof. ..... instr.
14. Is your employment ..... full time? ..... part time?
15. On which of the following is your regular contractual salary based? ..... 9/10 mos. ..... 11/12 mos.
16. Check the category in which your regular contractual salary falls.
    ..... Less than $8,000 ..... $11,000 - $13,999 ..... $17,000 - $19,999 ..... $23,000 - $25,999
    ..... $ 8,000 - $10,999 ..... $14,000 - $16,999 ..... $20,000 - $22,999 ..... $26,000 and above
17. Were you employed at any of the following before entering higher education?
    ..... elementary or secondary education ..... two-year institutions
18. In how many 4-year institutions of higher education have you been employed full time? .....
19. For how many years have you been employed in higher education? .....
20. For how many years have you been employed at this institution? .....
21. Please list the major positions, *other than those in education*, that you have held for one year or more since obtaining your baccalaureate degree. (Example: Secretary, Nurse)

    .....

    .....
22. If your professional career in higher education has been interrupted, please indicate in terms of years or fractions thereof the length of these interruptions.
    ..... birth and care of children ..... inability to obtain suitable professional employment
    ..... caring for aged parents ..... personal illness
    ..... graduate study ..... relocation of family due to husband's employment
    ..... illness of others ..... volunteer work
    ..... other ..... (Please Specify)

23. If you do not have a doctorate and do not plan to work toward that degree, please state your major reason for not doing so.

.....

.....

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND INVOLVEMENT

24. Check the area which best describes your work.

..... teaching ..... administration with some teaching
..... administration with no teaching ..... other ..... (Please Specify)

25. If you are engaged in administration, with or without teaching, please indicate your title and the area in which you work. (Example: Dean, Home Economics)

....., ... (Title) (Area)

26. If you are teaching, indicate your major area. (Examples: Elementary Educ., Biology) .....

.....

27. Have you been engaged as a consultant (with or without pay) during the past 5 years?

..... yes ..... no If so, how many times? .....

28. Have you done any research in the past 5 years? ..... yes ..... no

29. Did any of this research result in a degree? . . . in publication?

..... yes ..... no ..... yes ..... no

30. Have you authored or co-authored any published articles in the last 5 years?

..... yes ..... no If so, how many? .....

31. Please list the 3 periodicals in which you have published the greatest number of articles in the past 5 years.

.....

.....

32. Have you authored, co-authored, or edited any books during the past 5 years?

..... yes ..... no If so, how many? .....

33. Which of the following best describes the books indicated in the previous question?

..... textbooks ..... literary or expressive material
..... professional material ..... other ..... (Please Specify)

34. Check those *college-wide* committees, councils, or cabinets on which you served in the past 5 years.

..... Academic Council ..... Commencement Committee ..... Sabbaticals, Promotion, Tenure Committees
..... Administrative Council ..... Council of Deans
..... Admissions Committee ..... Curriculum Committee ..... Scholarship and Loans
..... Affirmative Action ..... Dean Selection Committee ..... Student Union Committee
..... Budget Committee ..... Faculty Council ..... Other .....
..... College or Univ. Senate ..... Graduate Council ..... Other .....

35. Place a second check mark before the names of any committees which you *chaired* during the past 5 years.

ATTITUDES AND SATISFACTIONS CONCERNING CAREER CHOICE

36. Use the suggested scale to show the influence that each of the following had on your choice of higher education as a career. (SCALE: 3 equals highly important, 2 equals important, 1 equals little or no importance)

..... the expected intellectual challenge
..... your interest in working with students of college age
..... the value of the career to society
..... the influence of a teacher, parent, or some other person
..... the opportunity to advance to an administrative post
..... the opportunity to do research and/or publish
..... good working conditions and/or good pay
..... chance

37. Please state the factor having the greatest influence on your having chosen a position in a *state-owned* college rather than a *private* institution of higher education.

101

.....

38. Rank in order of importance the three rewards that you deem of greatest value to you in your work. (Use 1 to indicate most valued reward)

..... the satisfaction gained from helping young people
..... the prestige associated with being a college professor or administrator
..... the intellectual stimulation provided by the environment
..... the pay check
..... other .....
..... other .....
..... other .....

(Please Specify)

39. Which of the following best expresses your feelings concerning your present position?

..... It is largely what I expected it to be
..... It is better than I had expected it to be.
..... It is somewhat less than I had expected it to be.

40. Please explain how and in what ways your present position is *better than* or *less than* you had expected.

.....

.....

41. Do you have aspirations of holding another position in higher education? ..... yes ..... no

42. If your answer to the above question was *yes*, please state what other position you would like.

.....

43. If your answer to question No. 41 was no, please indicate your chief reason for not wanting another position.

..... feel current position is satisfying and challenging
..... do not feel qualified for any other position
..... do not want the added or new responsibilities which another position would bring
..... do not desire the rigor of learning a new position
..... do not feel that as a woman you would be given serious consideration for a position other than teaching
..... other .....

(Please Specify)

44. What one reason would you say has been the source of greatest dissatisfaction to you in your career choice?

.....

.....

45. Listed below are several frequently cited reasons why women faculty do not enjoy equal status with their male colleagues. Indicate in each case whether you feel the situation, in general, is true on your campus.

	True	Untrue
Women are not given enough representation on school-wide policy making committees	.....	.....
Women are not given equal pay with men	.....	.....
Women are not given enough representation in administrative positions on the campus	.....	.....
Nepotism restrictions preclude the employment of some women	.....	.....
Not enough women faculty are hired	.....	.....
Although qualified, women are not promoted as quickly as men	.....	.....
Women do not aspire to holding administrative positions	.....	.....

46. Have you ever met the criteria for promotion to another rank and not received it?

..... yes ..... no

47. If your answer to the above question was *yes*, for which rank were you qualified?

..... prof. ..... assoc. prof. ..... asst. prof. ..... instructor

48. What official reason was given for your not receiving the promotion?

.....

49. Would you encourage young women to choose higher education as a vocation?

..... yes ..... no ..... uncertain

50. If your answer to the previous question was *no* or *uncertain*, please state your reason.

.....

.....

51. Do you think that in your profession being a woman has been

..... advantageous
..... disadvantageous
..... both advantageous and disadvantageous
..... neither advantageous nor disadvantageous

52. Please explain the rationale for your having checked the previous question as you did.

.....

.....

53. On the whole, how would you rate your satisfaction with your present career in higher education?
..... Very Dissatisfied ..... Dissatisfied ..... Indifferent ..... Satisfied ..... Very Satisfied

54. In what one way do you think your institution could better meet the needs of its female faculty.

.....

.....

.....

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!

Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed, pre-addressed envelope to:

Patricia L. Patterson
80 S. Eleventh Street
Indiana, PA 15701

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER TO QUESTIONNAIRE

80 South 11th Street
Indiana, Pa. 15701
January 5, 1974

Dear Colleague:

I am currently engaged in research concerning those of us who comprise the "female faculty" in Pennsylvania's 14 state-owned institutions of higher education. In order to obtain the kinds of information I need, your help is necessary.

This study focuses its attention on your personal background, work experience, present responsibilities, professional achievements, and your career satisfactions and aspirations. From the information obtained a descriptive profile will be developed of the women faculty in Pennsylvania's state college system. Naturally the adequacy of the profile is dependent upon its being truly representative of the women who are involved. Your data is needed!

A brief glance at the accompanying questionnaire will reveal that I would be less than honest to ask for a "few" minutes of your time. The women who pretested this instrument indicated that between 25 and 30 minutes were necessary to complete it. It has been highly structured so that many of the questions can be answered by a mere check mark. Although the demands on your time are many, I hope that you will not only complete the questionnaire; but will do so with candor.

The number on your form is for internal processing and follow-up. It is known only to the researcher. You are assured that all individual responses will be kept in strict confidence and that the findings will be grouped so that neither you nor your institution will be identifiable in the study.

I hope you will find the questionnaire interesting to answer and that you will complete it and return it to my by

February 1. For your convenience a stamped, pre-addressed envelope has been enclosed.

Give it your consideration, won't you!

Sincerely yours,

Patricia L. Patterson
Associate Professor
School of Business
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Enc. 2

APPENDIX C

Please! Please! Please!

Your questionnaire hasn't been returned. If it's been mislaid, I'll gladly send you another one because your information is important to my research effort.

PATRICIA PATTERSON

APPENDIX D

BIRTHPLACES OF RESPONDENTS

Location	Frequency	Percent
Alabama	2	.3
Arizona	1	.1
California	7	1.0
Colorado	3	.4
Connecticut	4	.6
Delaware	4	.6
District of Columbia	4	.6
Florida	4	.6
Georgia	1	.1
Hawaii	1	.1
Idaho	2	.3
Illinois	18	2.6
Indiana	12	1.7
Iowa	9	1.3
Kansas	3	.4
Kentucky	7	1.0
Louisiana	2	.3
Maryland	8	1.1
Massachusetts	14	2.0
Michigan	17	2.4
Minnesota	5	.7
Mississippi	1	.1
Missouri	6	.9
Montana	3	.4
Nebraska	2	.3
New Jersey	19	2.7
New York	62	8.9
North Carolina	8	1.1
North Dakota	3	.4
Ohio	29	4.3
Oklahoma	2	.3
Oregon	4	.6
Pennsylvania	344	49.6
South Carolina	3	.4
South Dakota	1	.1
Tennessee	1	.1
Texas	6	.9
Utah	3	.4
Vermont	1	.1

Location	Frequency	Percent
Virginia	6	.9
Virgin Islands	1	.1
Washington	2	.3
West Virginia	16	2.3
Wisconsin	7	1.0
Foreign Countries	38	5.6
Total	696	100.0

APPENDIX E

HIGHEST LEVELS OF EDUCATION SHOWN
BY LENGTH OF CONTRACT

Level	Total Number	Length of Contract 9- 10-month No.	%	11- 12-month No.	%
Baccalaureate	37	34	4.9	3	6.4
Master's	83	71	10.3	12	25.5
Work beyond master's - no doctorate	442	421	60.8	21	44.7
Doctorate	146	136	19.7	10	21.3
Post-doctoral work	31	30	4.3	1	2.1
Total	739	692	100.0	47	100.0

APPENDIX F

A REPRESENTATIVE GROUP OF THE PERIODICALS IN WHICH RESPONDENTS HAVE PUBLISHED WITHIN THE PAST FIVE YEARS

Aging (U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare)

American Dyestuff Reporter (SAF International, Inc.)

American Quarterly (University of Pennsylvania Trustees)

American Trancendental Quarterly (Emerson Society)

Analytical Chemistry (American Chemistry Society)

Analytical Letters (Marcel Dekker, Inc.)

Antiques (Straight Enterprises)

Athena (Pennsylvania AAUP Committee Newsletter)

Business Education Forum (National Business Education Association)

California Journal of Educational Research (California Teachers Assn.)

Child Welfare (Child Welfare League of America, Inc.)

Clearing House (Fairleigh Dickinson University)

Cleft Palate Journal (American Cleft Palate Association)

Craft Horizons (American Crafts Council)

Dermatologica (International Journal of Dermatology)

Educational Technology (Educational Technology Publications)

Elementary English (National Council of Teachers of English)

Expedition (University of Pennsylvania)

Gay (Four Swords, Inc.)

Gerontologist (Gerontologist Society)

Improving College and University Teaching (Oregon State University Press)

Journal of Algebra (Academic Press, Inc.)

Journal of Bacteriology (American Soc. for Microbiology)

Journal of Educational Psychology (American Psychology Assn., Inc.)

Journal of Experimental Education (Dembar Education Research Service, Inc.)

Journal of Experimental Psychology (Am. Psychology Assn.)

Journal of Geography (Japan Public Trading Co., Ltd.) (Text in Japanese)

Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation (Am. Assoc. for Health, Physical Education and Recreation)

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology (American Psychology Assn.)

Journal of Phycology (Phycology Society of America)

Journal of School Health (American School Health Assn.)

Journal of Speech and Hearing Research (American Speech and Hearing Association)

Library Journal (R. R. Bowker Co.)

Microform Review (Weston, Conn.)

Modern Maturity (American Association of Retired Persons)

P. T. A. Magazine (National Congress of Parents and Teachers)

Pennsylvania Education (Pennsylvania Education Association)

Pennsylvania Library Association Bulletin (Pennsylvania Librarian Association)

Pennsylvania Music Educators Assoc. News (Pa. Music Ed. Assn.)

Pennsylvania Nurse (Pennsylvania Nurses Assoc.)

Phycologia (International Phycological Society)

Publications of the Division of Girls' and Women's Sports (Am. Assoc. for Health, Physical Education and Rec.)

Reading Teacher (International Reading Assn.)

Redbook (McCall Publishing Co.)

Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin (American Rehabilitation Counseling Assn., Div. of American Personnel and Guidance Assn.)

Russian Orthodox Journal (Federated Russian Orthodox Clubs)

School Health Review (American Assoc. for Health, Physical Education and Recreation)

School Libraries (Now: School Media Quarterly) (Am. Assoc. of School Librarians)

School Science and Mathematics (School Science and Mathematics Assn.)

Today's Education (National Education Association)

Yale French Studies (Yale University)

APPENDIX G

TYPICAL RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION: WHAT ONE REASON WOULD YOU SAY HAS BEEN THE SOURCE OF GREATEST DISSATISFACTION TO YOU IN YOUR CAREER?

Organization and administration of higher education

"Attitude of those running higher education. Politics, not a sincere interest to do what is best for all concerned."

"Administrative irresponsibility."

"Lack of interest in academic values on the part of the administration."

". . . the purely 'commercial' view of education which seems to be more and more influential in administrative decision-making."

"The fact that so much emphasis is put on academic degrees and so little on teaching ability, initiative, outstanding and supplementary work."

". . . that I am ineligible for a full professorship (no doctorate). My salary is tied in with my rank, yet I have all the responsibilities and productivity of my professor colleagues."

"Failure on the part of administrative representatives to recognize ability in absence of doctorate and a consequent waste of human resources."

"Non-academic responsibilities; committees with administrative or governing duties."

"Trivia of committee meetings."

"Administrative 'red tape' which sometimes hinders the amount of assistance which can be given to students."

"The red-tape involved in coping with state restrictions."

"Complete 'de-humanization' trend of union and administration with regard to individual professor's personal value and contributions."

"Collective bargaining."

"The hassle with Harrisburg (P.D.E.) over budget and the strings [attached] and forms required for funds--travel, special projects, etc."

"The political short sightedness of the legislature: their lack of priorities and the policy of treating faculty as incompetents."

"Recent governmental attitudes towards the value (and funding) of higher education and research."

"The degree to which state politics and intra-college policies interferes with academic pursuits."

"The frustrations of a bureaucratic system encountered."

"Low pay."

"Absurdly large class size makes innovative teaching methods inappropriate, learning impossible, and close personal relationships prohibitive."

"Overload making it impossible to perform with maximum competence."

"Increased ratio of students to teachers."

"Bureaucrats who don't know how to utilize resources, talents, abilities of staff."

"The tremendous amount of work involved. Trying to teach effectively and do committee work is impossible, never mind publish."

". . . often unreasonable amount of time wasted in assanine meetings adding to an already long day."

"Too many demanding responsibilities of administration when employed as a teacher."

Climate of higher education

"Lack of an environment which fosters creativity and innovation! Great resistance to change."

"Slowness in bringing about change."

"The un-change of education!"

"Rigidity within the system."

"The frustration caused by lack of progress - 'We have never done it that way.' Old ideas governed by old men."

"The traditional conservatism of education."

"Lack of change in face of obvious need."

"Lack of intellectual stimulation in the college environment."

"The fact that I work as a part-timer since there are few openings for full-time work."

"The altered status of the job market in our field which makes for anxiety, jealousy, etc. among endangered faculty."

". . . feeling of insecurity and that one should 'teach' and probably pass poor students to keep jobs."

"Worrying about job security (retrenchment)."

"Too little scholarship and dedication to teaching and too much 'politics' in the profession today."

"Campus politics and its effect on the college, especially its effect in removing the faculty's concentration from its main commitment--namely, teaching."

"Pressure resulting from feelings of responsibility and work load."

Colleagues

"The other members of my department many of whom I have very little admiration or respect for. They show a lack of cooperation and humanistic concerns."

"Internal friction among co-workers, pettiness of people who are 'professionals.'"

"Lack of open, honest communication among colleagues in many instances."

"Disillusionment with enthusiasm and academic endeavor of higher education personnel."

"I become frustrated because education of the student is not the central concern of many educators. It becomes clouded with personal pride, competition, feelings, etc."

"The lack of professionalism in the faculty as a whole."

Career demands

"Extreme limitations of my time so that outside class professional activities are limited."

"The job demands too much of my time."

"Unending planning time needed to do an outstanding job."

"A teaching schedule that allows little time for research."

"The great demand of time beyond the regular working day."

"Lack of time to relax and continue my own interests in Early Childhood education."

Discrimination and/or role conflict

"That women many times have to work a great deal harder than men to achieve the same recognition for programing."

"I came with great enthusiasm, but feel controlled by being a woman. All positions of importance in the library go to men."

"The fact that until now there has been tremendous prejudice against husbands and wives in the same department and that now, because of falling enrollments, women, (especially wives), are the first to be dropped."

"The unfair treatment to female faculty for promotion, tenure, and even a permanent position, based on the argument that women are going to follow their husbands."

"Women's programs and physical education programs not getting the attention and support they should."

"Difficulties of being taken seriously on initial contact; assumption that a woman would not have administrative skills."

"Frustration over male chauvinism in some areas vitally effecting the welfare of women faculty and women students."

"Male domination--little chance for women to advance. . ."

"Condescending attitude of many male faculty members."

"Men administrators who favor men or condescendingly tolerate women."

"As a woman, being treated as if your position, opinions, and status were not equal to those of a man."

"Hiring policy of wives; other professional women are hired with lesser qualifications so not to break college policy."

"Frustrated with double standard regarding women's place in this field--wanting, yet fearing equal status and responsibility with men in field."

"Pressure to compete intellectually; male dominance reinforces inhibitions."

"Difficulty in doing justice to both career and family responsibilities."

"I find great frustration in knowing that a decision for career growth could negatively affect my marriage."

Students

"I am most disappointed with student response and motivation. I find myself wondering if the effort is worth it."

". . . working with students with poor cultural backgrounds who grow more job training oriented each year."

"Trying to involve students in the excitement of learning!"

"Many young people in college classes who are not interested in learning--who have been misdirected."

"The fact that students want a good grade without effort."

"The responsibility of evaluating students, especially since classes have become so large."

"Sometimes very difficult to see that my teaching has made much difference to the students."

"Inability to insure results from efforts."

"Working with and counseling college age students."

"The lowering of standards. I believe we are unfair to our young people by demanding nothing of them in this highest of educational experiences in a formal setting."

Low status of field work

"The unimportant role given to physical education by others in higher education."

"Negative attitude of teaching faculty toward professional status of library faculty."

"The lack of respect teaching faculty show for student affairs administrators."

"The fact that nursing is not viewed as an intellectual science by members of the science department."

Other

"I feel I need more education."

"Getting my Master's Degree in a general area rather than a specialized field."

"The isolated location of this institution."

"I got into it too late in life--due to my own feelings of inferiority."

"My own lack of discipline and organization. . ."

"That I have been unable to complete a doctorate."

"Knowing that I am perpetuating a career that will always attack a generous and loving individual."

"Poor social contacts."

"Stagnation."

"Do not feel the job is useful."

APPENDIX H

A CHI-SQUARE TEST OF INDEPENDENCE BETWEEN DEGREE OF CAREER SATISFACTION AND THE INFLUENCE OF THE RESPONDENTS' DESIRE TO WORK WITH STUDENTS OF COLLEGE AGE

Degree of Satisfaction	Of Little Importance	Important	Highly Important
Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, indifferent	12* (6.1823) 5.4746	26 (23.6771) .2279	50 (58.1406) 1.1398
Satisfied, very satisfied	35 (40.8176) .8292	154 (156.3329) .0345	392 (383.8595) .1726

*In this and all subsequent appendices the first number in each block is the reported frequencies, the number in parentheses is the expected frequencies, and the third number is the individual chi square.

APPENDIX I

A CHI-SQUARE TEST OF INDEPENDENCE BETWEEN DEGREE OF CAREER SATISFACTION AND THE INFLUENCE OF THE VALUE OF THE CAREER TO SOCIETY

Degree of Satisfaction	Of Little Importance	Important	Highly Important
Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied	20 (13.1429) 3.5776	15 (23.1837) 2.8888	17 (15.6735) .1123
Indifferent	11 (7.0769) 2.1748	13 (12.4835) .0214	4 (8.4396) 2.3354
Satisfied, very satisfied	130 (140.7802) .8255	256 (248.3328) .2367	171 (167.8871) .0577

APPENDIX J

A CHI-SQUARE TEST OF INDEPENDENCE BETWEEN DEGREE OF CAREER SATISFACTION AND EXPECTATIONS CONCERNING PRESENT POSITION

Degree of Satisfaction	As Expected	Better than Expected	Less than Expected
Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied	12 (31.5167) 12.0857	4 (14.0639) 7.2016	45 (15.4194) 56.7475
Indifferent	5 (15.5) 7.1129	0 (6.9167) 6.9167	25 (7.5833) 40.0012
Satisfied, very satisfied	355 (324.9833) 2.7725	162 (145.0194) 1.9883	112 (158.9972) 13.8917

APPENDIX K

A CHI-SQUARE TEST OF INDEPENDENCE BETWEEN DEGREE OF CAREER SATISFACTION AND ASPIRATIONS CONCERNING OTHER POSITIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Degree of Satisfaction	Yes	No
Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied	36 (22.7248) 7.755	26 (39.2752) 4.4871
Indifferent	16 (11.3624) 1.8928	15 (19.6376) 1.0952
Satisfied, very satisfied	213 (230.9129) 1.3896	417 (399.0871) .8040

APPENDIX L

A CHI-SQUARE TEST OF INDEPENDENCE BETWEEN DEGREE OF CAREER SATISFACTION AND REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: WOMEN ARE NOT GIVEN ENOUGH REPRESENTATION ON SCHOOL-WIDE POLICY-MAKING COMMITTEES

Degree of Satisfaction	Yes	No
Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied	49 (35.2171) 5.3942	10 (23.7829) 7.9876
Indifferent	18 (15.5194) .3965	8 (10.4806) .5871
Satisfied, very satisfied	318 (334.2636) .7913	242 (225.7364) 1.1717

APPENDIX M

A CHI-SQUARE TEST OF INDEPENDENCE BETWEEN DEGREE OF CAREER SATISFACTION AND REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: WOMEN ARE NOT GIVEN EQUAL PAY WITH MEN

Degree of Satisfaction	Yes	No
Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied	24 (13.5461) 8.0676	25 (35.4539) 3.0824
Indifferent	7 (6.3584) .0647	16 (16.6416) .0247
Satisfied, very satisfied	131 (142.0956) .8664	383 (371.9044) .3310

APPENDIX N

A CHI-SQUARE TEST OF INDEPENDENCE BETWEEN DEGREE OF CAREER SATISFACTION AND REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: WOMEN ARE NOT GIVEN ENOUGH REPRESENTATION IN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS ON THE CAMPUS

Degree of Satisfaction	Yes	No
Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied	59 (57.7553) .7392	4 (10.2447) 3.8065
Indifferent	26 (23.4468) .2780	2 (4.5532) 1.4317
Satisfied, very satisfied	466 (474.7979) .1630	101 (92.2021) .8395

APPENDIX O

A CHI-SQUARE TEST OF INDEPENDENCE BETWEEN DEGREE OF CAREER SATISFACTION AND REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: NEPOTISM RESTRICTIONS PRECLUDE THE EMPLOYMENT OF SOME WOMEN

Degree of Satisfaction	Yes	No
Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied	25 (14.7778) 7.0710	24 (34.2222) 3.0533
Indifferent	9 (6.6349) .8431	13 (15.3651) .3641
Satisfied, very satisfied	137 (149.5873) 1.0592	359 (346.4127) .4574

APPENDIX P

A CHI-SQUARE TEST OF INDEPENDENCE BETWEEN DEGREE OF CAREER SATISFACTION AND REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: NOT ENOUGH WOMEN FACULTY ARE HIRED

Degree of Satisfaction	Yes	No
Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied	46 (36.6791) 2.3686	15 (24.3209) 3.5722
Indifferent	19 (15.6337) .7248	7 (10.3663) 1.0932
Satisfied, very satisfied	306 (318.6872) .5051	224 (211.3128) .7617

APPENDIX Q

A CHI-SQUARE TEST OF INDEPENDENCE BETWEEN DEGREE OF CAREER SATISFACTION AND REACTION TO THE STATEMENT: ALTHOUGH QUALIFIED, WOMEN ARE NOT PROMOTED AS QUICKLY AS MEN

Degree of Satisfaction	Yes	No
Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied	38 (27.9489) 3.6146	15 (25.0511) 4.0327
Indifferent	22 (13.1834) 5.8962	3 (11.8166) 6.5782
Satisfied, very satisfied	239 (257.8677) 1.3805	250 (231.1323) 1.5402

APPENDIX R

A CHI-SQUARE TEST OF INDEPENDENCE BETWEEN DEGREE OF CAREER SATISFACTION AND THE EFFECT ON CAREER OF BEING FEMALE

Degree of Satisfaction	Advantageous	Disadvantageous	Both	Neither
Very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, indifferent	4 (12.8631) 6.1070	33 (11.0622) 43.5056	40 (43.8630) .3402	16 (25.2166) 3.3686
Satisfied, very satisfied	96 (87.1369) .9015	53 (74.9378) 6.4222	301 (262.2822) 5.7155	180 (170.7884) .4968

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arter, Margaret Helen. "The Role of Women in Administration In State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Arizona State University, 1972.

Astin, Helen S., and Bayer, Alan E. "Sex Discrimination in Academe." Educational Record, LIII (Spring, 1972), pp. 101-118.

Bayer, Alan E. College and University Faculty: A Statistical Description, ACE Research Report. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970.

_____. Teaching Faculty in Academe: 1972-73. ACE Research Report. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973.

Bernard, Jessie. Academic Women. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (The). Report and Recommendations of the Commission. Opportunities for Women in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Carnegie-Mellon University Commission on the Status of Women. "University Women: Less Than Equal at C.M.U." School & Society, March, 1972, pp. 143-144.

Chalmers, E. L., Jr. "Achieving Equity for Women in Higher Education Graduate Enrollment and Faculty Status," The Journal of Higher Education, XLIII (October, 1972), pp. 517-530.

Cook, Alice H. "Sex Discrimination at Universities: An Ombudsman's View." AAUP Bulletin, LVIII (Autumn, 1972), pp. 279-281.

Cook, Walter W. A Study of Job Motivations, Activities, and Satisfactions of Present and Prospective Women College Faculty Members. A Partial Report, May 31, 1968. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota under contract with the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Project 557, 1960.

Dinerman, Beatrice. "Sex Discrimination in Academia." The Journal of Higher Education, XLII (April, 1971), pp. 253-264.

Eckert, Ruth E. "Academic Woman Revisited: Minnesota." Liberal Education, LVII (December, 1971), pp. 479-87.

_____., and Stecklein, John E. Job Motivations and Satisfactions of College Teachers. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1961.

Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs. Woman's Place. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

_____., and Goods, William J., eds. The Other Half. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Ginzberg, Eli. Life Styles of Educated Women. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Harmon, Lenore W. "Women's Interests--Fact or Fiction?" Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLV (May, 1967), pp. 895-900.

Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women and the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women. 1968: Time for Action. Washington, D. C.: 1968.

Karch, Jacqueline Quigley. "Characteristics of Women Teachers of Education in Institutions of Higher Learning in the United States of America." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Washington University, 1956.

Kreps, Juanita M. "The Woman Professional in Higher Education." Women in Higher Education. Edited by W. Todd Furniss and Patricia A. Graham. Washington: American Council on Education, 1974.

La Sorte, Michael A. "Academic Women's Salaries: Equal Pay for Equal Work?" The Journal of Higher Education, XLII (April, 1971), pp. 265-278.

Leonard, Yvonne Elaine. "An Analysis of the Status of Women as Full-Time Faculty Members in Coeducational Colleges and Universities of California." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1963.

Lewis, Edwin C. Developing Woman's Potential. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1968.

Loeb, J. and Ferber, M. "Sex As A Predictive of Salary And Status on a University Faculty." Journal of Educational Measurement VIII (Winter, 1971), pp. 235-244.

Mead, Margaret, ed. and Kaplan, Frances B., ed., American Women. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

Oltman, Ruth M. Campus 1970 Where Do Women Stand? Research Report of a Survey on Women in Academe. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Women, 1970.

Pollard, Lucille Addison. "Women on College and University Faculties: A Historical Survey and a Study of Their Present Academic Status." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Georgia, 1965.

Report of the Joint Task Force on Sexism in Education. Joseph F. Bard, chairman. Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1972.

Rossi, Alice. "Ambivalence in Women: Should We Plan for the Real or the Ideal?" Adult Leadership, September, 1967, pp. 100-102.

_____. "Discrimination and Demography Restrict Opportunity for Academic Women." College and University Business, XLVIII (February, 1970), pp. 74-78.

U. S. Department of Labor. Trends in Educational Attainment of Women. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.

U. S. Department of Labor. Underutilization of Women Workers. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971.

VITA

Patricia L. Patterson received her elementary and secondary education in the public schools of New Kensington, Pennsylvania. She graduated in 1950 from Grove City College where she received a Bachelor of Science in Commerce Degree. Her Master of Education Degree was conferred in 1957 by the Pennsylvania State University.

After having taught in public schools for six years, Miss Patterson joined the faculty at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. She is currently employed at that institution as an associate professor in the Business Education Department.